DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 089 CS 508 955

AUTHOR Jones, Tricia S.; Carlin, Diane
TITLE Philadelphia Peer Mediation Program: Report for 1992-1994 Period.
SPONS AGENCY Colorado Counseling Association, Fort Collins.; Good Shepherd Neighborhood House, Philadelphia, PA.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 94
NOTE 94p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Communication Skills; *Conflict Resolution; *Interpersonal Communication; Program Effectiveness; Public Schools; Secondary Education; Student Attitudes; *Training
IDENTIFIERS Mediation Techniques; *Peer Mediation; *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

A preliminary study identified areas of success and impact of a peer mediation program to be implemented in 60 middle and senior high schools in the Philadelphia Public School District during the 1993-1996 academic year periods. During the 1992-1994 period, 719 students and adults received peer mediation training. Data were collected from approximately 80% of all participants. Results indicated that: (1) over 360 disputes were mediated with an average agreement rate of 90%; (2) students and adults were highly satisfied with peer mediation training; (3) peer mediation training improved students' conflict management skills; (4) attitudes about conflicts were related to race, sex, and respondent status; and (5) mediation training decreased students' perceptions that physical violence was an appropriate conflict management behavior. Factors critical to peer mediation program success were the quality of training, training materials that were age-appropriate and culturally sensitive, publicity, administrative support, and coordination and logistics. (Contains 25 tables of data. Appendixes present interview schedules, observation note and content analysis system, quantitative measures, and a peer mediation project summary.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 089

PHILADELPHIA PEER MEDIATION PROGRAM

REPORT for 1992-1994 PERIOD

prepared for

Good Shepherd Neighborhood House
and the
Office of Desegregation of the Philadelphia Public School District

by

Tricia S. Jones, Ph.D.
and
Diane Carlin, M.A.

Dept. of Rhetoric and Communication
Temple University
265-65 Weiss Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19122
tel/fax: 215-204-7261/8543

Report Issued August 1, 1994

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS508555

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PHILADELPHIA PEER MEDIATION PROGRAM

REPORT for 1992-1994 PERIOD

prepared for

Good Shepherd Neighborhood House
and the
Office of Desegregation of the Philadelphia Public School District

by

Tricia S. Jones, Ph.D.
and
Diane Carlin, M.A.

Dept. of Rhetoric and Communication
Temple University
265-65 Weiss Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19122
tel/fax: 215-204-7261/8543

Report Issued August 1, 1994

PHILADELPHIA PEER MEDIATION PROGRAM
REPORT FOR 1992-1994 PERIOD

© 1994, Philadelphia Peer Mediation Collaborative

Do not reprint without permission. For permission to reproduce sections of this report, contact:

Cheryl Cutrona, Executive Director
Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program
5356 Chew Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19138
tel./fax: (215) 843-5413/2080

or

Tricia Jones, Ph.D. or Diane Carlin, MA
Department of Rhetoric and Communication
Temple University
265-65 Weiss Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19122
tel./fax: (215) 204-7161/8543

Table of Contents

Executive Summary ..... i-v

Introduction 1

Overview of the Peer Mediation Program 2

Study Design and Methods 3

Results 13

Training Participants 13
Number of Cases Mediated 14
Evaluation of Training 15
Content Analysis of Role-Play Mediations 17
Pre-Test/Post-Test Results 18
Data from 1992-1993 18
Data from 1993-1994 20
Characteristics of Mediations 24
Nature of Mediated Disputes 24
Causes of conflicts
Duration of conflicts
Gender of disputants
Race of disputants
Disputant grade
Disputant experience with mediation
Referral source
Mediator characteristics
Mediation agreements
Evaluation of Mediation Process and Outcome 29
Mediator process evaluation
Disputant process evaluation

Factors Affecting Program Efficacy and Recommendations 32

Training 32
Publicity of Program 35
Program Design and Implementation 37

Summary and Future Research Concerns 41

Appendices

Executive Summary

Peer Mediation Project

- Good Shepherd Neighborhood House and the Office of Desegregation of the Philadelphia Public School District are collaborating to **introduce peer mediation programs to 60 middle and senior high schools during the 1993-1996** academic year periods.

  The goals of the program include: *to provide students and teachers with the communication, interpersonal, leadership, problem-solving and other conflict management skills associated with mediation.*

- The Temple University Evaluation team is collecting **qualitative and quantitative data over a three year period** to identify areas of success and program impact. Data sources for the current report include:

  Interviews with Peer Mediators
  Interviews with Staff/Teachers/Administrators
  Observations of Training
  Content Analyses of Mediation Role-Plays
  Quantitative Measures on Frequency of Mediation and Agreements
  Quantitative Training Evaluation Questionnaire
  Quantitative Pre-test/Post-test Questionnaires
  Quantitative Mediator and Disputant Debriefing Questionnaires

Results to Date

- **Peer Mediation Programs were begun in 29 schools during the 1992-1994 period.** Nine schools were trained in the 1992-1993 academic year and twenty schools were training in the 1993-1994 academic year. These schools represent elementary, middle and senior high schools from all major sections of the school district.

- **719 students and adults** have received peer mediation training in these schools to date. Data were collected from approximately 80% of all participants. Information about participants in the sample includes:

  Approximately 40% were male and 60% were female at the student level.

  Approximately 20% were male and 80% were female at the staff level.

Approximately 75% were from 5th to 8th grade; 25% were 9th to 12th grade.

Approximately 50% were African-American, 5% were Asian-American, 20% were Caucasian, 6% were Hispanic-American, 4% were Interracial and 7% were Other.

- **Over 360 disputes have been mediated in the 1992-1994 period** with an average **agreement rate of 90%.**

Types of Conflicts Mediated

The majority of conflicts referred to mediation involve verbal disagreements, physical fighting and rumors. Agreement rates are similar for all three types of disputes.

Conflicts referred to mediation range in duration from very short to longer than one month. Agreement rates are similar regardless of duration of conflict before mediation.

Who Uses Mediation?

Females are more likely to be involved in mediation than males.

Females are more likely to be in mediation due to conflicts concerning rumors ("he said, she said") while males are more likely to be in mediation for conflicts involving physical fighting.

A greater percentage of disputants completing disputant-evaluation forms were African-American than Caucasian, Hispanic or Asian-American students.

Mediation was most commonly used by students in grades 6 through 9; but a surprising number of students in grades 1 through 4 also used mediation.

Although small, a number of students are already repeat users of mediation.

Sources of Referrals to Mediation

Over 25% of referrals to mediation come from students (either other students or self-referrals by students).

Conflicts involving physical fighting are more likely to be referred by teachers and adminstrators.

Conflicts involving verbal disagreements are more likely to be self-referrals or student referrals.

Types of Agreements

Agreements are most likely to be simple, usually consisting of promises to "be friendly, keep the peace, or stop disruptive behavior" or agreements to avoid one another.

Satisfaction with Mediation Process and Outcome

Mediators are satisfied that their training adequately prepared them for actual mediation.

Mediators were very satisfied with mediation process and outcome.

Disputants were very satsified with the mediation process and outcome.

Disputants would use mediation again and would recommend mediation to their friends.

Disputants expressed interest in going through peer mediation training themselves.

- **Students and adults are highly satisfied with peer mediation training.** They believe it is effective in teaching students and adults more constructive ways of dealing with conflicts. There are some differences in evaluations of training due to gender, age and race of the participants.

Females are generally more satisfied with peer mediation training than males.

Adults are generally more satisfied with training than students.

Caucasian students are generally more satisfied with training than African-American, Hispanic, or Asian-American students.

- **Peer Mediation training improves students' conflict management skills.**

Students are able to learn and apply mediation skills and concepts.

Content analysis data suggests students are strongest in introductory, opening statement behaviors and fact-finding.

Students are competent in caucusing and finding solutions, but less so..

- **Attitudes** about conflicts were **related to race, sex and respondent status**.

  Females were less likely than males to agree that conflicts should be avoided and less likely than males to agree that fighting is an appropriate means of dealing with conflict.

  Race was related to perceptions of the appropriateness of fighting.

  Younger students are more influenced by friends and peers in terms of their approach to conflict than older students or staff.

- Pre-test/post-test data suggest that peer mediation **training does alter attitudes about conflict. Specifically, medition training decreases students' perceptions that physical violence is an appropriate conflict management behavior.**

Factors Critical to Peer Mediation Program Success

- The **quality of training is key to program success.** Training should be sufficiently substantial in length and content. It should be delivered by persons experienced in conducting mediation and training mediators in community and educational contexts.

  Emphasize experiential learning

  Retain student-staff training mix.

  Increase attention to specific skill practice.

  Prepare students as trainers.

- Training materials and training excercises/approaches should be **age-appropriate and culturally sensitive.**

- **Publicity** of the peer mediation program is necessary to build school-wide support for and use of peer mediation program.

  Improve publicity quantity and quality.

  Improve recruitment efforts.

- **Administrative support is absolutely necessary** for the continuing support of and success of peer mediation programs. Such support helps guarantee the provision of

necessary resources in terms of staff and equipment and helps provide recognition for the program and its successes.

- **Coordination of peer mediation process and logistics is important** to guarantee an efficient process and satisfactory outcome.

Additional Comments

- Peer mediation programs are a recent and innovative addition to public education. Their utility and impact should not be judged prematurely. Most programs will take between 3-5 years to fully develop although positive impacts may be seen in earlier stages as well as later ones.

- Success of peer mediation should be studied in terms of broader issues of changing ways of thinking about and responding to conflict as well as specific improvements in school discipline and student behavior.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents a preliminary evaluation of the Philadelphia Peer Mediation Project implemented through a partnership of Good Shepherd Neighborhood House and the Office of Desegregation of the Philadelphia School District during the 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 academic year periods. The original design of the project described the implementation of peer mediation programs in Phases I, II, III, etc. Although this report is written in terms of academic year periods, there is a simple correspondence between the Phases and the Academic Years. Phase I schools received their initial mediation training in 1992-93. Phase II schools received their initial training in fall of 1993 and their second training in spring of 1994. Phase III schools received their first training in spring 1994; they are scheduled to receive their second training in fall of 1994.

Nine peer mediation programs were implemented in nine public schools during the 1992-1993 academic year. In the 1993-1994 academic year, twenty schools received mediation training. Of these schools eleven were Phase II and nine were Phase III schools. during the 1993-1994 period. Data from these schools serve as the basis for this evaluation.

The peer mediation programs discussed here are part of a larger initiative to institutionalize peer mediation in the School District of Philadelphia that will ultimately involve the development and administration of peer mediation programs in at least 60 middle and/or senior high schools. In each academic year, at least twenty new schools will receive peer mediation training and implement peer mediation programs. In addition, previously incorporated schools will be monitored to assess their continuing administrative and resource commitment to the expected minimum three-year tenure of each program.

Several goals for this project have been established by Good Shepherd Neighborhood House and the Office of Desegregation of the School District. Among those goals are:

1. To institutionalize peer mediation in the School District of Philadelphia.
2. To decrease incidents of violence in the schools.
3. To offer an alternative to suspensions and expulsions.
4. To improve school attendance.
5. To provide students and teachers with the communication, interpersonal, leadership, problem-solving and other conflict management skills associated with mediation.

The primary purpose of this preliminary evaluation and the forthcoming evaluations is: (1) to determine whether and to what extent the peer mediation programs have been successful in achieving these goals, (2) to report on additional outcomes of the programs, and (3) to identify critical factors that inhibit or enhance the success of peer mediation programs.

It is important to note at the outset that this report is one of a series of reports that will be issued during the three year period of the project. As such, the report is necessarily preliminary in its conclusions and does not attempt to suggest the "success" or "failure" of the program at this stage. Rather, the information presented here is intended as a "progress" report in the truest sense of the phrase. The evaluation team is working with the Good Shepherd program to identify "best practices" and possible areas of improvement as the program matures. It is in the students' and schools' interests to encourage improvements to the program prior to the end of the three year period. Thus, our expectation is that changes will be made as the program proceeds and that those changes will be monitored and the evaluation research design adjusted accordingly.

It is also important to comment on the notion of "success" that lies at the center of all evaluation research. There is not a consensual definition of success for peer mediation programs. In fact, different participants in the programs --students, administrators, parents, teachers, trainers, etc.-- may have different notions of what makes a peer mediation program "successful" and how that can or should be measured. The evaluation reported here attempts to respect a variety of perspectives on success. In keeping with that intent, data collection methods have been adopted that provide both qualitative and quantitative measures and provide "voice" to all participants in the programs.

Overview of the Peer Mediation Program

Peer mediation is a process that involves one or two students acting as neutral third parties to assist their peers in handling disputes. Mediation is a voluntary process that enables disputants to come to their own agreement about how to handle the conflict. As a result, peer mediators rely on communication and mediation skills to help the parties talk about the conflict more effectively and to engage in problem-solving processes.

The peer mediation training provided by Good Shepherd involves students and non-trainer adults (teachers, administrators, counselors, security personnel, NTAs, etc.) in a four-day program. Students and adults are trained together for approximately six hours per day on four consecutive school days. The training includes exercises, role-plays, and other experiential learning techniques that aid students in the understanding and application of the mediation process.

Participating schools are asked to sign an agreement committing the school to support the peer mediation program for at least three years. This support takes the form of: (1) providing at least three site coordinators to participate in training and oversee the program (this commitment clearly necessitates the provision of resources to cover the teachers' or staff members' regular duties while they are involved in training), (2) providing space in which to conduct mediation training and hold subsequent mediation sessions, (3) agreeing to collect basic information and maintain paperwork about the number of mediation sessions held and their outcomes, and (4) agreeing to promote the use of mediation to resolve conflicts between students.

Good Shepherd provides several services. First, they provide orientation to students, faculty and staff. Orientation usually includes a recruitment activity (assembly and/or homeroom presentation that introduces the nature of peer mediation to interest students in participating in the program) and teacher/staff orientation sessions (e.g., staff meeting presentations). Second, Good Shepherd provides the mediation training for each school for two semesters. Further training may occur. In these cases, Good Shepherd is likely to be the provider of subsequent training. Third, Good Shepherd provides ongoing support and consultation for the peer mediation programs through the on-site, weekly visits of one of the staff trainers. Each trainer is assigned as a support person for up to four schools. Each school is to be visited for 1/2 day, two times per school week for the period including the semester of and the semester immediately following the first peer mediation training. The intent is to have each school become independent in the administration of their program by the end of the second year. Fourth, Good Shepherd collects and maintains evaluation data in conjunction with the Temple University evaluation team to provide feedback to the schools on the success of their efforts.

Study Design and Methods

The research reported here is the first stage in a multi-stage evaluation project. The entire project is a longitudinal field study involving the collection of qualitative and quantitative data to determine the efficacy of peer mediation programs. The initial stages of the evaluation relied heavily on the collection of qualitative data to identify critical factors for further evaluation. This grounding provided information that was translated into quantitative measures. Results from these measures and the continuing qualitative observation and interviewing support the narrowed evaluation design for the upcoming 1994-1995 academic year period. This design is discussed in more detail at the end of this report.

Participating Schools

Data were collected in two stages, corresponding to the academic year periods. During 1992-1993 nine schools received training. Of these schools, eight participated in the data collection during May/June 1993. During 1993-94, twenty public schools received training. All schools participated in the data collection during the August, 1993 to May, 1994 period.

Table 1
Participating Schools

Participating Schools 1992-1993	Participating Schools 1993-1994
Elementary Schools Phase I Taggart*	**Elementary Schools** Phase I - Training 2 Taggart

Sharswood	Sharswood Phase II Ethan Allen Finletter Henry Phase III Ada Lewis Bache-Martin Carnell Spruance
Middle Schools Phase I Harding Stoddart-Fleisher Vaux	**Middle Schools** Phase I - Training 2 Harding Stoddart-Fleisher Vaux Phase II Farrell Shawmont Pickett Roosevelt FitzSimons Phase III Jackson Washington Woodrow Wilson
High Schools Phase I Furness Kensington Lincoln South Philadelphia	**High Schools** Phase I - Training 2 Furness Kensington Lincoln South Philadelphia Phase II Gratz Olney Strawberry Mansion Phase III Martin Luther King

** The ninth school trained during 1992-1993, Taggart Elementary, was not included due to difficulties scheduling data collection. However, the data collected from Sharswood Elementary provide some insights into the Taggart experiences because both schools shared the training program and initial follow-up activities.*

These schools represent the northeast region (Lincoln, Harding, Farrell, Ethan Allen, Finletter, Woodrow Wilson, Spruance), central east region (Kensington,

Olney, Harding), central west region (Gratz, FitzSimons, Strawberry Mansion), southeast region (South Philadelphia, Thomas, Bache-Martin, Jackson, Vaux, Stoddart-Fleisher, Furness, Sharswood, Taggart, George Washington,), southwest region (Shaw), and northwest region (Shawmont, Roosevelt, Henry, Pickett, Martin Luther King).

Measurement Data Collected:

Given the extensive nature of this peer mediation program and the process evaluation design employed, a multi-method, team research based triangulation approach to data collection was conducted. Data resulted from qualitative focus group interviews with peer mediators, qualitative individual and/or group interviews with administrators and site coordinators of the programs, observations of training, in situ content analyses of mediation role-plays during training, quantitative measures of training effectiveness, quantitative pre-test and post-test measures, and quantitative assessment instruments for mediators' and disputants' evaluations of actual mediation sessions and outcomes. Each of these measures is discussed in more detail below.

Interviews

Focus group interviews with peer mediators from each program were conducted. Each school provided permission for the interviews to be held, selected the peer mediators who participated in the interviews, and established an appropriate interview time (usually one class period). Participating students were informed of the nature and purpose of the interviews prior to the interview. Students gave signed informed consent to participate in the interviews and to have the interviews audiotaped for the purposes of data transcription. Interviews were usually conducted by two members of the evaluation team. The interviews asked students to respond to general questions about their experiences in training, as peer mediators, and their ideas to improve the programs. Copies of the interview questions (for student and adult interviews), letter to the schools, and consent forms are provided in Appendix A.

Interviews with the administrators and site coordinators were also arranged in advance with the permission of the school. In most cases the interviews were with individuals rather than groups; however, some group interviews occurred for scheduling convenience. Again, prior to the beginning of the interview the nature and purpose of the interview was explained and researchers obtained informed consent. These interviews focused on the goals for establishing the program, the desired outcomes, and the organizational support necessary to sustain the program as well as the evaluation of the training experience and student participation.

Observations and Content Analysis

A team of ten trained observers observed the mediation training at the participating schools. These observations concentrated on aspects of the training environment, training pedagogy, and student/staff behavior during training. One aspect of the observations was

in situ content analyses of the mediation role-plays. A content analytic system of critical mediation behaviors was developed from the mediator training materials. During role plays these behaviors were monitored and rated to determine the extent to which students were able to learn and apply the behavioral skills discussed in the training. A copy of the field observation note form is included in Appendix B.

Quantitative Measures

The quantitative data available for the pilot programs comes from the following four sources. Copies of these instruments are presented in Appendix C.

1) Frequency data on the number of mediations held and the number of agreements reached. Data were obtained from three general sources.

First, some schools simply reported a sum representing the number of mediation sessions held and the number of sessions ending in agreement. This method was exclusively used during the 1992-1993 period and was used by some schools in the 1993-1994 period. Of these latter schools, reasons for reliance on this method of reporting ranged from difficulties administering other instruments, difficulties in maintaining data files during the school year, and/or forgetfulness, to unwillingness to divulge information that may violate "confidentiality" of the mediations.

Second, mediation intake forms provided information about the nature of the conflict referred to mediation, the referral source, the age and gender of the disputants, and the decision to schedule or not schedule mediation. All conflicts referred to mediation should have completed intake forms. Yet, again, data collection was spotty.

Third, mediation agreement forms were available in some instances. Initially, all schools were to maintain copies of the agreement forms for all disputes where mediation was successful in helping disputants reach agreements. The agreement forms included information about the co-mediators' gender and dyadic composition (whether the co-mediation team was male/male, female/female, or male/female), the disputants' gender and grade, and a summary of the agreement reached. Content analysis of agreement types was performed on this data.

2) Student and Staff evaluation of training. Training evaluation instruments were completed by student and staff participants at the end of mediation training. These instruments assessed the participants' perceptions of the quality of training. In the evolution of the research project changes were made to the evaluation instrument. In this report, results are included only from the most recent instrument which was used in the 1993-94 period.

3) Student and Staff Pre-test/Post-test. A simple pre-test/post-test questionnaire was developed to assess participants' orientations to conflict and understanding of mediation. In addition, some demographic information concerning grade/age level, race and gender

were collected. Most schools administered and collected this information. During the 1992-1993 period schools administered the pre-test but not the post-test. Only data from 1993-1994 enables comparisons. Thus, while data reporting will include basic information from both periods, all comparative analysis is restricted to the 1993-94 period.

4) Mediator and Disputant Debriefing Forms: After each mediation session mediators and disputants were to complete debriefing instruments that gauged their satisfaction with the process and outcome of mediation. Although collection of this data was often irregular, a sufficient sample was obtained from the 1993-1994 schools.

The mediator debriefing forms asked mediators (either individually or as a co-mediation team) to indicate whether specific mediation strategies and tactics (e.g., explanation of mediation, explanation of confidentiality, caucusing) had been used in that session. Mediators also indicated their level of satisfaction with the mediation, their perceptions of the disputants' satisfaction, and whether an agreement was reached.

The disputant debriefing forms also asked disputants (individually) to respond to items about whether the mediators had used specific tactics, whether agreement was reached, their level of satisfaction with the mediation process and outcome, and their willingness to use mediation or refer others to mediation. Disputant gender, race, grade and age was also requested.

Sampling

Given the different sources of data, sampling information is provided for each source separately. Sampling information is broken down into demographic classifications (race, gender, age/grade) where available. All samples were convenience samples due to the reliance on self-selection for participation in interviews and completion of questionnaire data. However, all attempts were made obtain exhaustive samples from the training evaluation and pre-test/post-test measures and to obtain representative samples in the interview processes.

Given the obvious control limitations in this type of field research, sampling strategies were generally successful. The interview sample size often equaled or exceeded 40% of the total population and questionnaire data sample size usually ranged between 80 - 90% of total population trained.

Sampling for Interviews

1992-1993 Interviews: In all, 51 peer mediators participated in the focus group interviews during the 1992-93 data collection period. The breakdown in participation for each school is noted below in Table 2:

Table 2
Peer Mediator Participants in Focus Group Interviews
for the 1992-1993 Period

School	Total
Lincoln	3
Kensington	4
Vaux	4
Harding	11
Sharswood	7
Stoddart-Fleisher	9
South Philadelphia	6
Furness	7
Totals	51

Although exact numbers are not available for all sessions, the racial representation in the interviews was mixed, often approximating 40-50% African American, 40-50% Caucasian, 10-20% Hispanic/Latino, 0-5% Asian-American, and 0-5% "other" or interracial students. The sample of peer mediators interviewed comprised approximately 41% of all of the students trained as peer mediators during the 1992-1993 academic year period. Specifically, 125 students were trained and 51 students were interviewed. The gender balance in the sample approximates the gender make-up of the population. Approximately 40% of the interviewees were male and 60% were female.

A total of 25 adults were interviewed. These adults were generally classified into two groups: 1) administrators and 2) teachers/staff personnel which included teachers, NTAs, security, counselors, school psychologists, etc. The adults interviewed constituted 63% of the total number of adults trained in the pilot programs. Specifically, 25 adults were interviewed out of the 40 adults trained.

1993-1994 Interviews: Interviews with peer mediators and adult participants were conducted in 14 of the schools participating in the 1993-1994 period. A total of 107 peer mediators were interviewed. The gender and racial proportions in this interview sample is approximate to the 1992-1993 sample.

Table 3
Peer Mediators in Focus Interviews, 1993-1994

School	Total
Bache-Martin	7
Ethan Allen	8
Farrell	7
Henry	8
Jackson	26

Roosevelt	7
Sharswood	7
Taggart	7
Washington	7
Gratz	8
Shawmont	5
Olney	4
Strawberry Mansion	7
Total	107

In addition, 33 adult participants were interviewed individually. All of the schools indicated in Table 3 had at least one adult participant interviewed.

Sampling for Quantitative Measures

Evaluation and Pre-test Instruments: The collection of training evaluation questionnaires and pre-test/post-test questionnaires during the 1992-1993 period was difficult and therefore, data obtained were often incomplete or insufficient. Data collection for the 1993-1994 schools was more successful. The following table indicates the data available from each school:

Table 4
Questionnaire Data Collected by School

School	Student Pretest	Student Posttest	Student Eval.	Staff Pretest	Staff Posttest	Staff Eval.
Ethan Allen Elem. (P2)	15	13	12	5	4	3
Farrell M.S. (P2)	13(old)	nc	12(old)	4(old)	nc	4
Finletter M.S. (P2)	16	15	15	5	4	4
Harding M.S. (P1-Training 2)	16	13	12	3	nc	nc
Shawmont K-8 (P2)	16	15	15	4	2	nc
Taggart Elem. (P1-Training 2)	nc	16	11	nc	1	1
Vaux M.S. (P1-Training 2)	14	nc	14	nc	nc	2
Henry Elem. (P2)	16	16	15	4	3	3
Pickett M.S. (P2)	nc	14	12	nc	3	nc
Roosevelt M.S. (P2)	15	nc	12	4	nc	3
Sharswood Elem. (P2)	20	15	15	nc	nc	nc
Stoddart-Fleisher M.S. (P1-Training 2)	nc	12	9	nc	3	3
Furness H.S. (P1-Training 2)	17	nc	18	4	nc	2

Gratz H.S. (P2)	14	11	11	3	1	nc
Kensington H.S. (P1-Training 2)	18	5	7	6	3	6
Olney H.S. (P2)	9(old)	nc	10(old)	1 (old)	nc	2(old)
Strawberry-Mansion H.S. (P2)	13(old)	nc	15(old)	nc	nc	5(old)
South Philadelphia H.S. (P1-Training 2)	10	9	9	4	4	4
Lincoln H.S. (P1)	14(old)	nc	nc	4(old)	nc	3(old)
Kensington H.S. (P1)	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc
Vaux M.S. (P1)	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	3(old)
Harding M.S. (P1)	24(old)	nc	nc	5(old)	nc	nc
Sharswood K-8 (P1)	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	2(old)
South Philadelphia H.S. (P1)	29(old)	nc	nc	10(old)	nc	7(old)
Stoddart-Fleisher M.S. (P1)	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc	nc
Furness H. S. (P1)	11(old)	nc	nc	4(old)	nc	2(old)
Woodrow Wilson M.S. (P2)	18	19	19	4	5	5
Washington M.S. (P2)	15	8	11	5	3	4
Jackson M.S. (P2)	16	16	16	2	1	1
Fitzsimmons M.S. (P2)	13	13	13	1	2	3
Bache-Martin Elem. (P2)	16	16	16	5	4	4
Ethan Allen (P2-Training 2)	10	13	14	3	3	4
Spruance (P3)	15	14	15	4	2	4
Carnell (P3)	16	16	16	4	3	4
Farrell (P2-Training 2)	16	18	16	3	3	3
Henry (P2-Training 2)	18	19	19	5	4	5
Martin Luther King	12	14	13	5	4	5
Ada Lewis Elem. (P2)	14	15	16	4	4	4
TOTALS	479	340	408	115	66	101

Note: nc = not collected. Notations of (old) means the older form of the instrument was used.

Mediation Measures: Table 5 presents information concerning the number of mediation intake, agreement, mediator debriefing and disputant debriefing forms collected at the end of the 1994 school year. This table only includes information about actual questionnaires/instruments completed and does not represent summated mediation session/agreement data reported by schools. That information is presented later in Table 6.

Table 5
Mediation Measures Collected by School for 1993-1994

School	Intake Forms	Mediator Debriefing	Disputant Debriefing	Agreement Forms
Pickett	3	3	4	2
Strawberry Mansion	17	5	17	5
Ethan Allen	57	23	10	55
Bache-Martin	0	3	0	3
Ada Lewis	0	0	0	0
Henry	18	11	6	16
Roosevelt	9	10	12	9
Shawmont	5	5	6	5
Shaw	0	0	0	0
Andrew Jackson	1	1	0	1
Farrell	6	11	11	7
Woodrow Wilson	8	4	4	7
George Washington	3	0	2	2
South Philadelphia	3	0	0	2
Furness	10	0	0	10
Sharswood	5	2	4	4
Vaux	4	0	0	2
Finletter	4	6	6	4
Taggart	28	8	2	23
Thomas	4	4	8	4
Simon Gratz	8	5	2	4
Lincoln	0	0	0	0
Stoddard-Fleisher	10	8	6	58
Totals	203	109	100	223

Data Analysis:

Given the amount and variety of data collected in this study and the different questions of interest to be answered, the data were analyzed using statistical and non-statistical methods that may be unfamiliar to the reader. This section provides a very brief overview of the data analyses used. This information should be helpful in understanding the reported

results in both text and tables. If more explanation of methods is required, please contact the primary author at the numbers listed on the cover page of the report.

Non-statistical Analyses

Qualitative data were generated from the focus group interviews with mediators, interviews with staff, interviews with members of the Good Shepherd training team, and observations of the training. Qualitative data of this nature provides a rich resource for the identification of themes and patterns that may suggest avenues for further exploration. Qualitative data also provides detailed information about unique perceptions or insights that may be obscured in more quantitative methods of analysis. Inductive analysis was used to generate themes or regularities in the data. Those regularities also enabled identification of unique or idiosyncratic events or information.

Statistical Analyses

Three general interests guided the statistical analysis of data. Each interest is explained below with a discussion of the statistics involved.

First, there was an interest in being able to answer questions about "how much" something was happening or "who" was involved using simple descriptive statistics like frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Frequency counts simply report how many times something occurred, e.g., how many times mediations occurred or how many times people reported a particular answer to a question. Percentages were used to provide proportional data, .e.g., what percentage of disputants were male or female, or what percentage of mediators reported that they used caucusing in their mediations. For interval level scales that are designed to measure attitudes, opinions or perceptions (like the strongly agree to strongly disagree items on some questionnaires) means and standard deviations are the descriptive statistics reported. The mean score (abbreviated as "M" in the text) is the average score. The standard deviation (abbreviated as "sd" in tables and text) is a measure of dispersion or variance, a way of determining how much difference there was in the responses to a particular item. If the standard deviation is very large it indicates that there is little consensus among the respondents. The less consensus there is (as indicated by the standard deviation), the less meaningful the mean, or the average score becomes.

Second, there was an interest in identifying associations or relationships between important variables, for example, determining whether there was a relationship between a mediator's satisfaction with the mediation process and his or her perceptions of the disputants' satisfaction with the mediation process. Relationships were examined differently depending upon the scaling of the item or variable in question. For nominal scales (yes, no or other), relationships were examined using a statistic called chi square. This statistic compares the observed responses to what would have been expected by chance alone. For variables measured by interval level scales (rating scales of 1-5, or

strongly agree to strongly disagree items), questions of relationship or association were examined using correlation.

And, third, there was an interest in determining sources of difference, for example, whether certain groups differed in their perception of the training. Only variables using interval-level measures were involved in these analyses. When differences between two groups were examined (for example, when the scores for males and females were compared), the t-test was employed. When differences between more than two groups were of interest (for example, when the scores for African-American, Caucasian, Hispanic, and Asian-American students were compared), an ANOVA (analysis of variance) was used.

All of the statistics discussed thus far are only meaningful once they are examined in terms of "statistical significance", or whether the statistical result (whether chi square, correlation coefficient, t-score, or F-score used in ANOVA) is sufficiently high to reject the null hypothesis at a specific degree of freedom and probability level. In all cases only statisitcally signiificant results are discussed in this report. The conventional $p<.05$ was used to determine statistical significance, or rejection of the null hypothesis. However, results that were $p>.05$ are reported with reference to the operative alpha level of that result (e.g., $p<.01$, $p<.001$).

Results

Training Participants

A total of 165 adults and students received training in the nine peer mediation programs during November, 1992 and March, 1993. A total of 554 adults and students were trained in the twenty-four peer mediation trainings conducted during August, 1993 and June, 1994. Thus, a total of 719 adults and students have been trained in the Philadelphia Public School District in the Good Shepherd program.

The sample size on pre-test and post-test measures and training evaluations is approximately 80% of the total population trained. Specifically, data were collected from 594 of the 719 training participants.

Approximately equal numbers of girls and boys received training as peer mediators. The vast majority of adults participating in training were female members of the staff or faculty. On average, less than 20% of the adult participants were male. Relatively few administrators participated in the training.

Number of Cases Mediated

How many cases are actually being referred to peer mediation? The data collected on numbers of cases mediated and numbers of agreements reached in the 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 years are presented below.

Table 6
Number of Mediations and Agreements

Year	School	Mediations	Agreements
1992-1993	Total for All Schools	72	66 (92%)
1993-1994	Strawberry Mansion	17	11
	Kensington	18	18
	Roosevelt	9	9
	Stoddart-Fleisher	58	58
	Vaux	4	2
	Farrell	7	7
	Ethan Allen	57	55
	Furness	25	25
	Harding	12	10
	Pickett	3	2
	Shawmont	5	5
	Thomas	4	4
	Gratz	8	4
	Taggart	28	23
	Finletter	4	4
	South Philadelphia	3	2
	Washington	3	2
	Wilson	8	7
	Jackson	1	1
	Bache-Martin	3	3
	Henry	18	16
	Totals 1993-1994	295	268 or 91%
GRAND TOTALS		367	330 or 90%

Although these numbers may appear low, only four of the schools in the 1992-1993 period were trained before March, 1993. Similarly, approximately half of the schools trained in the 1993-1994 period were trained in the fall semester. Programs receiving training during the spring semester have little time to publicize the program and refer cases to mediation. In addition, these numbers only include information about the formal mediations taking place. Several peer mediators have commented that informal mediations are common in their schools although data is not recorded about them.

Evaluation of Training:

A total of 509 students and staff responded to the training evaluation instrument (either version 1 used during 1992-1993 or version 2 used during 1993-1994). Of that total, 36% were male and 60% were female with 4% not reporting gender. 83% of respondents were students and 17% were staff. 79% were from non-high schools (defined as grades 5 through 8 in either elementary or middle schools) and 21% of respondents were from high schools (grades 9 through 12). In terms of the percentages of respondents from specific grades, the results are as follows: 5th grade, 6%, 6th grade, 21%, 7th grade, 21%, 8th grade, 15%, 9th grade, 6%, 10th grade, 6%, 11th grade, 3%, 12th grade, 3%, missing data, 18% (mainly staff). The racial/ethnic breakdowns of respondents are as follows: African-American, 50%, Asian-American, 4%, Caucasian, 24%, Hispanic, 6%, Interracial, 4%, and Other, 7%, and 5% failed to report that data.

As Table 7 suggests, the means from the evaluation items confirm that the majority of participants were very satisfied with the training. **Items were scored with 1 indicating strong agreement and 5 indicating strong disagreement. Thus, the lower the mean the more satisfied, or in agreement, the respondents were.**

Table 7
Training Evaluation Results

Item	Mean	sd
The training manuals were easy to follow.	1.72	.84
The training manuals covered all the information I needed about mediation.	1.61	.71
The mediation trainers explained all mediation procedures clearly.	1.39	.65
The mediation trainers answered all questions to my satisfaction.	1.44	.68
The mediation trainers provided opportunities for persons to express their views about mediation.	1.52	.85
The mediation trainers gained my trust and confidence.	1.55	.78
In general, the training included enough time to practice skills in resolving conflict.	1.63	.84
In general, the training enhanced my skills for resolving conflict.	1.54	.69
In general, the training met my needs.	1.72	.76
The training did a good job of preparing me to mediate conflicts.	1.51	.71

Statistical analyses were performed on the evaluation data to determine whether the participant's sex, school level (non-high school vs. high school), status (student or staff), or race was associated with evaluation of the training. T-Tests were conducted on all of the training evaluation items for the factors of sex, school level, and status. An ANOVA was conducted on each of the items for the race variable.

Although the overall evaluation was very positive, there were some areas where females responded more positively than males. Specifically, females (M=1.54) felt that the manuals were more informative than males (M=1.72) (t=2.73, df=476, p<.01) and females (M=1.33) felt that the trainers explained things more clearly than did males (M=1.48) (t=2.49, p<.05). Females (M=1.48) were also more in agreement than males (M= 1.65) with the statement that the trainers gained their trust and confidence (t=2.51, p<.05).

Students and staff differed slightly in their perception of the training. Staff participants (M=1.82) were less likely than students (M=1.58) (t=2.44, p<.05) to agree that ample time had been given to practice their conflict skills. Students (M=1.79) were less likely than staff (M= 1.35) to agree that the manuals were easy to understand. Staff respondents (M=1.24) were more likely than students (M=1.48) to agree that the trainers had answered all of their questions fully (t=3.05, p<.05). Staff (M=1.28) were also more likely than students (M=1.60) (t=3.64, p>.01) to suggest that the trainers gained their trust and confidence and provided opportunities for people to express their views about mediation (Staff M=1.35, Student M=1.55, t=1.96, p<.05).

The only difference in perceptions of training due to the school type (high school or non-high school) related to the manuals. Participants in high schools (M=1.56) felt the manuals were easier to understand than participants in non-high schools (M=1.76) (t=2.10, p<.05).

The results of the ANOVA suggested five differences due to race. The first difference concerned perceptions of the degree to which trainers explained all aspects of the mediation procedure clearly. Caucasian respondents (M=1.22) agreed with this statement more than African-American respondents (M=1.43), and both groups agreed with this more than Asian-Americans (M=1.52) or Hispanic-Americans (M=1.71) (F[3, 416]=5.93, p<.01). Similarly, there were differences in perceptions of how much the training enhanced the respondents' conflict skills. Caucasian respondents (M=1.37) were more in agreement that the training enhanced their skills than African-Americans (M=1.61), Asian-Americans (M=1.57), or Hispanic-Americans (M=1.71) (F=3.86, p<.01). Caucasian (M= 1.50) participants were more likely than African-American participants (M=1.78) to agree that the training met their needs. Both groups were more likely to feel that training met their needs than Asian-American participants (M=1.95) or Hispanic-American participants (M= 1.96) (F=5.30, p<.01). Caucasians were more likely to indicate that they thought the manuals were easy to understand (M=1.52) than African-American (M=1.79), Asian (M= 1.84) or Hispanic (M=1.71) participants (F=2.97, p<.05). And, Caucasian participants were more likely to agree that the trainers had answered their questions (M=1.30) than African-American (M=1.52), Asian (M = 1.84) or Hispanic (M= 1.71) participants (F=2.95, p<.05).

Content Analyses of Role-Plays:

The content analyses of mediation role-plays during training provided evidence to assess whether trainees were able to learn and apply the mediation skills discussed in the training. During the 1993-1994 period, data from content analyses of 27 mediation role-plays were collected during observations in nine different schools. **Each behavior listed below was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "poor" and 5 being "excellent". Thus, the higher the mean, the more satisfactorily the peer mediator was able to perform the behavior.**

Table 8
Results of Content Analyses

Behavior	Mean	sd
Opening Statement: Introduction	4.64	.58
Opening Statement: Description	4.55	.74
Opening Statement: Explanation	4.55	.74
Opening Statement: Rules	4.45	1.01
Opening Statement: Confidentiality	4.64	1.05
Opening Statement: Summarize	4.45	.84
Opening Statement: Overall Rating	4.09	1.31
Fact-finding: Gather Information	4.04	.93
Fact-finding: Maintain Rules	4.25	.99
Fact-finding: Listening	3.92	.97
Fact-finding: Summarizing	4.04	1.00
Fact-finding: Interests	3.79	1.00
Fact-finding: Overall	3.97	.98
Caucusing: Explanation	3.30	1.33
Caucusing: Gather Information	3.57	1.20
Caucusing: Summarization	3.35	1.37
Caucusing: Appropriateness	4.09	1.20
Caucusing: Overall	3.43	1.16
Finding Solutions: Brainstorming	3.68	1.25
Finding Solutions: Evaluating	3.56	1.10
Finding Solutions: Bargaining	3.67	1.19
Finding Solutions: Identifying Options	3.83	1.20
Finding Solutions: Summarizing	3.89	1.32
Finding Solutions: Overall	3.67	1.08

The results clearly indicate that students were able to learn and apply the mediation skills taught during training. However, some skills were more easily learned and/or applied than others. The students seemed to excel in the opening statement skills which included making introductions, describing mediation and its purpose, explaining the mediation process, covering basic rules of interaction followed in mediation, discussing confidentiality and its limits, and summarizing that information as a transition into fact-finding. Students also did well in the fact-finding behaviors. They were particularly accomplished at gathering information through questions, maintaining ground rules of interaction, and summarizing. They were slightly less competent in the skills of listening, paraphrasing and identifying interests.

Although the students' behavior in the role-played mediations supports the assumptions that they are able to learn and practice caucusing and finding solutions, the content analysis results also indicate that these skills are not as refined as the opening statement and fact-finding skills. Students were moderately competent at explaining caucusing, gathering information during the caucuses and summarizing that information. Similarly, students were moderately competent in behaviors associated with finding solutions: brainstorming options with the disputants, evaluating options presented, bargaining and/or negotiating, identifying options and summarizing the solutions and agreements.

Pre-test/Post-test Results

The student and staff pre-tests and post-tests were designed to provide data concerning: (1) demographic information on the training group, (2) information about the frequency of conflict interactions, and (3) insights into conflict orientations and understandings of mediation. As mentioned earlier, the pre-test and post-test questionnaires were altered after the 1992-1993 period. Further, the schools receiving training in the 1992-1993 period only collected pre-test data. Thus, limited information will be reported for the data collected from the nine schools trained in 1992-1993. The data from the 1993-1994 schools will be covered much more extensively.

Data from 1992-1993 Version of the Pre-test/Post-test Measure

In total, ten schools were administered the initial version of the pre-test/post-test instrument (One school trained in early August, 1993 used the earlier forms of the instrument because the new forms were still in preparation).

A total of 159 pre-test questionnaires were collected. 42% of the respondents were male and 55% were female (with 3% missing data). 28% of the responses were gathered from non-high schools and 72% were from high schools. 79% of respondents were students and 21% were staff members. In terms of grade level, 7% were from 6th grade, 12% from 7th grade, 3% from 8th grade, 16% from 9th grade, 16% from 10th grade, 16% from 11th grade, 6% from 12th grade and 23% were missing this data. 47% of

respondents were African-American, 8% were Asian-American, 31% were Caucasian, 6% were Hispanic-American, and 5% were "other". Even interpreted cautiously, this data suggests that the participants in the peer mediation training represented a fairly broad cross-section of the school population in terms of grades, race, and gender.

In addition to demographic information, the pre-test asked participants to report on how frequently they had been involved in fights during the past six months and how often they were asked to help resolve a fight in the last six months. Both questions asked respondents to indicate whether the frequency was "none", "one to four times", "five to eight times", or "nine or more times".

Frequency of Conflict Involvement: The question of frequency with which the training participants are involved in conflicts was examined in relation to the race, sex, status, and school level of the respondents. Only where significant differences were found will descriptive data be presented.

The only demographic variable that was significant was respondent status. Table 9 presents data concerning the relationship between respondent status and conflict frequency. Students were generally more likely to be involved in conflicts than staff (Chi square = 6.53, $p<.05$).

Table 9
Respondent Status and Conflict Frequency

Respondent Status	Conflict Frequency				
	None	One to Four	Five to Eight	Nine or More	Total
Student	18.7%	39.4%	12.3%	11.0%	81.3%
Staff	1.9%	9.0%	1.9%	5.8%	18.7%

There was no statistically significant relationship (as assessed by a chi squared test) between the self-reported conflict frequency of participants and participants' race/ethnicity. Essentially, the frequency with which students are involved in conflicts is not related to their race or ethnicity according to this self-report data.

The relationship between conflict frequency and gender was also not statistically significant. Contrary to gender-role expectations, the data indicate that males and females report similar levels of involvement in conflicts over the past six months.

Finally, there was no relationship between the school level (non-high school versus high school) and conflict frequency as reported by participants. High school and non high school students report similar levels of conflict involvement.

Frequency of Requests to Aid in Others' Conflicts: The responses to the question concerning how frequently participants were asked to help others resolve their conflicts were also studied in relation to the race, sex, respondent status and school level of the participant.

Table 10 presents data on the relationship between respondent status and resolution frequency. The chi squared results (36.34, $p<.01$) indicate that staff were more likely than students to be asked to resolve others' conflicts.

Table 10
Respondent Status and Resolution Frequency

Respondent Status	Resolution Frequency				
	None	One to Four	Five to Eight	Nine or More	Total
Student	20.8%	42.2%	9.1%	7.1%	79.2%
Staff	1.3%	5.2%	3.2%	11.0%	20.8%

Finally, there was no significant relationship between respondent's race, gender, or school level and resolution frequency.

Data from the 1993-1994 Version of the Pre-test/Post-test

Data were collected from nineteen schools. In all, 861 pre-test and post-test questionnaires were collected. Specifically, 53.4% of the questionnaires were pre-tests and 46.6% were post-tests. The difference is due to the normal attrition in the training, largely from staff rather than students.

37% of responses were from males and 61% were from females. The vast majority of responses (85%) were from non-high schools and 15% were from high schools. Similarly, 82% were from students and 18% from staff. In terms of grade level, 10% were 5th grade, 23% were 6th grade, 24% were 7th grade, 13% were 8th grade, 4% were 9th grade, 5% were 10th grade, 2% were 11th grade, and 1% were 12th grade. The racial breakdowns are as follows: African-American, 51%, Asian-American, 2%, Caucasian, 27%, Hispanic-American, 7%, interracial, 3%, and other, 8%.

Frequency of Conflict Involvement: Once again, the relationship between self-reported frequency of conflict involvement and the respondent's race, gender, school level and status was examined. The findings are similar to the findings from the 1992-1993 period.

There were no significant relationships between frequency of conflict involvement and race, gender or school level. There was a relationship between respondent status and conflict frequency as Table 11 shows. Students were generally more likely to be involved in conflicts than staff (Chi square = 98.52, $p<.05$).

Table 11
Respondent Status and Conflict Frequency, 1993-94

Respondent Status	Conflict Frequency				
	None	One to Two	Three-Four	Five or More	Total
Student	37.7%	35.2%	7.4%	2.5%	82.7%
Staff	5.5%	4.5%	1.7%	5.5%	17.3%

Frequency of Requests to Aid in Others' Conflicts: The responses to the question concerning how frequently participants were asked to help others resolve their conflicts were studied in relation to the race, sex, respondent status and school level of the participant.

Table 12 presents data on the relationship between respondent status and resolution frequency. The chi squared results (202.85, $p<.01$) indicate that staff were much more likely than students to be asked to resolve others' conflicts.

Table 12
Respondent Status and Resolution Frequency, 1993-94

Respondent Status	Resolution Frequency				
	None	One to Two	Three-Four	Five or More	Total
Student	33.4%	35.6%	10.9%	3.0%	82.8%
Staff	1.3%	4.2%	2.7%	9.0%	17.2%

Finally, as in the data from the previous year, there was no significant relationship between respondent's race, gender, or school level and resolution frequency.

Attitudes About Conflict Management Approaches: The newer version of the pre-test/post-test instrument also had five Likert scales that determined the participants' attitudes toward conflict management approaches. Those items and their overall means and standard deviations are represented in Table 13. **The items were scored on a strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5) scale. Thus, the lower the mean the more agreement there is with the statement.**

Table 13
Means for Conflict Orientation Items

Item	Mean	sd
I'd rather avoid conflict than face it and confront the other person.	2.70	1.31
When people have conflicts they should try to work with the other person	1.44	.68

to solve it.		
Physical fighting is an effective way to deal with a conflict.	4.07	1.30
In general, I let my friends influence the way I deal with conflicts.	3.95	1.48
Overall, I think I handle conflict effectively.	2.19	1.41

In addition to the issue of training impact on conflict attitudes, it is interesting to note that responses to these items were influenced by some of the demographic factors. Knowing how these factors affect attitudes toward conflict may help to target training efforts, program publicity and recruitment initiatives.

Attitudes about the appropriateness of avoiding conflicts are affected by gender and respondent status. Females (M = 1.37) were more likely to agree that people should attempt to use collaborative approaches to conflict than males (M=1.53) ($t=3.40$, $df = 830$, $p<.001$) even though both groups clearly felt that collaboration was a generally positive thing. Similarly, males (M=3.94) were much more comfortable with physical fighting as a response than were females (M= 4.13) ($t=2.02$, $p<.05$).

Students and staff differed in their orientations to conflict. Students were more likely than staff to avoid conflicts (Student Mean = 2.61, Staff M=3.09, $t=4.12$, $p<.001$), to agree that physical fighting is an appropriate response to conflict (Student M= 3.90, Staff M = 4.82, $t=8.32$, $p<.001$), and to indicate that their responses to conflicts are influenced by their peer group (Student M= 3.87, Staff M = 4.25, $t=3.65$, $p<.001$).

There are predictable indications that younger people are more influenced by peers or friends than older people. Non-high school participants (M = 3.87) are more likely to be influenced than high school participants (M = 4.37) ($t = 4.42$, $p<.001$). Students in middle and elementary schools were more likely to avoid conflicts (M=2.64) than high school students (M=3.00) ($t=2.86$, $p<.01$). Similarly, non-high school students (M = 2.23) felt they were less effective as conflict managers than high school students (M = 1.96) ($t=2.00$, $p<.05$).

Finally, there was one difference due to race. The results of the ANOVA indicate that Caucasians (M = 4.50) were significantly less likely to agree that fighting is an appropriate response to conflict ($F[3,718]=14.34$, $p<.001$) than African-Americans (M=3.81), Asian-Americans (M=4.00) or Hispanics (M=3.89).

Attitude Change Related to Training: A central purpose of peer mediation is to change students' attitudes toward conflict management approaches. To determine whether there were significant differences in students' attitudes before and after peer mediation training, t-tests were run on the data. The results are indicated in Table 14.

Table 14
Pre-test and Post-test Comparisons

Item	Pre-test Mean	Pre-test sd	Post-test Mean	Post-test sd
Avoid conflict	2.75	1.22	2.64	1.41
Collaborate	1.41	.64	1.46	.72
Fight	4.18	1.21	3.94	1.37**
Influence	3.89	1.15	4.00	1.21
Effectiveness	2.22	.89	2.16	1.82

There was a significant difference ($t = 2.59$, $df = 836$, $p<.01$) between the pre-test and post-test answers to the question on fighting. After mediation training the participants were more likely to agree that physical fighting is not an appropriate way to handle conflicts.

In order to see whether the demographic variables of race, sex, respondent status, and school type may have affected the scores on pre-test/post-test items, a series of ANOVAs were performed using race, gender, school level, and respondent status as between subjects factors.

Table 15
Pre-test/Post-test Means by Respondent Status

		Students	Staff
Avoidance	Pre-test	2.71*	3.00*
	Post-test	2.52*	3.20*
Collaboration	Pre-test	1.39	1.45
	Post-test	1.48	1.38
Effectiveness	Pre-test	2.23	2.18
	Post-test	2.21	1.96
Fighting	Pre-test	4.01	4.90
	Post-test	3.77	4.73
Influence	Pre-test	3.82	4.24
	Post-test	3.94	4.28

The training seemed to have different impact on students' and staff members' attitudes about avoidance. After receiving training, students were more likely to indicate that they try to avoid conflict; while after training, staff were more likely to indicate that they did not try to avoid conflict ($F=2.75$, $p<.05$).

There were no significant effects for the race, gender, or school level variables.

Assumptions About Conflict Causes: The third objective of the pre-test was to gain insights into the conflict orientations of students and adult participants prior to training. A series of open-ended questions asked respondents to comment on their thoughts about conflict, assumed causes of conflict, ways to manage conflict, reactions to anger, causes of conflicts at their school, etc. As expected, there were a wide variety of responses; however, the findings suggest general themes.

Staff, or the adult participants, reported that when they thought of conflict they associated it with disagreements, resolution, and general problems. Most suggested that conflicts were caused by misunderstandings, ignorance or a lack of information/knowledge, and poor communication. Not surprisingly, they usually indicated that better communication was critical to manage conflict effectively. From their perspective, conflicts at their school often resulted from racial tensions, rumors, neighborhood disputes, verbal violence, jealousy (or boy/girl issues) and stealing.

Students suggested that they associated fighting, problems, anxiety, violence, and wanting to help the other with thoughts of conflict. They listed arguments, fights for clothes or possessions, relationships, and rumors as general causes for conflict and suggested that talking and staying "in control" was critical for effective conflict management. They suggested that most conflicts at their school were caused by fighting over boyfriends/girlfriends, stealing, not showing respect for another, racism, and trying to "act tough".

Characteristics of Mediations:

Data from the mediation measures discussed earlier (intake forms, agreement forms, mediator evaluations, and disputant evaluations) provide important information about the nature of the disputes that are being mediated as well as the participants' attitudes about mediation process and outcome. These measures were available only for the 1993-1994 period. However, of the 295 mediations that were reported in this time period, data on intake and/or agreement forms that describe the nature of the disputes involved are available for 223 (or 76%). 109 mediator evaluations and 100 disputant evaluations were obtained. However, these represent a smaller percentage of mediation case data since the trend was for data to be obtained from both mediators and both disputants in a particular session. Thus, data on these measures were obtained for approximately 20% of mediated cases during 1993-1994.

Nature of Mediated Disputes

It is important to gain a clearer understanding of the types of disputes that are being referred to mediation. Available data was analyzed to discover: causes of conflicts resulting in mediation, duration of conflicts, disputant gender and grade, and disputants' previous experience with mediation.

Causes of Conflicts: On both the mediation intake forms and the mediator evaluation forms one item concerns the causes for the conflict leading to mediation (or at least referral to mediation). Those options provided include: verbal disagreement, rumors ("he said, she said"), physical fighting, truancy, behavior problems, rules violations, property-related disputes, money-related disputes, or other causes. More than one cause could be cited for a particular dispute. It is not clear whether the reported causes of conflicts are a result of the disputants' indication of the cause during an intake interview or the intake person's interpretation of the cause. Results for this variable should be interpreted with this caution in mind.

A preliminary review of the data revealed that only four of these causes were reported frequently: verbal disagreement, rumors, physical fighting, property/money (combined). As Table 16 reports, a significant percentage of the conflicts referred to mediation involved physical fighting and/or verbal disagreement. A lesser, but significant percentage, involved rumors.

Table 16
Causes of Conflicts Referred to Mediation

Cause	Reported	Not Reported
Verbal Disagreement	63%	37%
Physical Fighting	51%	49%
Rumors	25%	75%
Property/Money	7%	93%

Duration of Conflicts: Upon referral to mediation, information was gained about the known duration of the dispute. Parties were asked how long they had been involved in this particular dispute. The results indicate that conflicts of varying duration are referred to mediation. Specifically, in 17% of cases the duration of the conflict was unknown, in 38% the duration was less than one week, in 19% of cases the conflict had lasted between one week and four weeks, and in 25% of cases the conflict had lasted more than one month.

Gender of Disputants: Data were gathered on the gender of the initiating party, the gender of the responding party, and the gender composition of the disputing parties (male/male, female/female, and male/female). The results consistently indicate that females are more likely to be involved in mediation than males. Specifically, 59% of initiating parties were female and 41% were male. 57% of responding parties were female and 43% were male. And 48% of the cases involved female/female dyads, while 31% involved male/male and 21% involved male/female. These results may suggest that females are involved in more disputes and are being referred to mediation more frequently. Conversely, they may indicate that females are more willing to try mediation when the opportunity arises. The latter interpretation would be consistent with the information gained in the pre-test/post-test data that females are more likely to collaborate or attempt to collaborate in conflict situations than males.

Given the predominance of females using mediation, the relationship between the gender of the initiating party and the reported cause of the conflict was examined. As Tables 17 and 18 indicate, there is a significant relationship between gender and two causes of conflict: fighting and rumors. No relationship was found for gender of the initiating party and causes of verbal disagreement or property/money-related disputes.

Table 17
Gender and Fighting

Gender of Initiating Party	Reported	Not Reported
male	43%	26%
female	47%	51%

Table 18
Gender and Rumors

Gender of Initiating Party	Reported	Not Reported
male	9%	60%
female	37%	61%

As the data suggests females were more likely than males to report rumors as a cause of the conflict referred to mediation (chi square = 10.24, df=2, $p<.01$) and females were proportionately less likely to report fighting as a cause of the conflict (chi square = 6.91, df=2, $p<.05$).

Race of Disputants: Although race/ethnicity information is not obtained on the intake or agreement forms, some insights are available through the self-reported race of disputants on the disputant evaluation forms. The results are reported in terms of percentages of respondents.

The results indicate that a greater percentage of disputants identified themselves as African-American than any other racial group. Specifically, 69% of disputants were black, 2% were Asian-American, 16% were Caucasian, 1% were Hispanic, 2% were interracial, and 4% were other. Given the limited sample of disputant debriefing forms, it is unclear whether this finding indicates that throughout the peer mediation programs, African-American students are disproportionately likely to use mediation.

Disputant Grade: The preponderance of the data throughout this evaluation study has been from non high school rather than high school sources. 83% of mediation data is from non high-schools and 17% is from high schools. What is interesting and somewhat surprising is the unexpectedly large percentage of disputants from grades one through 4 as presented in Table 19.

Table 19
Disputant Grade

Grade	Initiating Party	Responding Party
1	1%	1%
2	3%	3%
3	4%	5%
4	6%	4%
5	10%	12%
6	21%	21%
7	21%	21%
8	17%	16%
9	10%	9%
10	5%	5%
11	1%	2%
12	1%	1%

Disputant Experience With Mediation: Although peer mediation programs were new in these schools, it was interesting to see whether mediation was attracting "repeat users" even in this short tenure. During mediation intake disputants were asked whether they had had prior experience with mediation in general and whether they had been involved in mediation with this specific disputant prior to this incident. Of the respondents reporting this information, 10% had used mediation before as the initiating party, 6% had used mediation before as the responding party and 84% had not used mediation before. When asked whether they had experience in mediation with this other party, 2% reported that they had and 98% reported they had not. Initially these figures appear to not support a conclusion that mediation is attracting repeat users. However, given the time length of the programs, these figures are indicative of more patterned use than expected.

Referral Source: Table 20 presents data concerning the sources of referrals to mediation. As the data suggest, referrals frequently come from "authority figures" like teachers and principals. These results are not surprising considering the percentage of cases where physical fighting was indicated as a cause of the conflict. However, a significant percentage of referrals are from students and self-referrals. In fact, over 25% of the total referrals are from "non-adult", "non-authority" sources.

Table 20
Referral Sources

Source of Referral	Percentage
Teacher	24%
Student	14%
Counselor	15%
NTA	2%

Self	12%
Other (Principal, Security)	35%

Data were analyzed to determine whether there were significant relationships between referral sources and causes of conflict. In other words, were certain kinds of disputes more likely to be referred by students rather than adults and vice versa. Table 21 presents the findings. Results of chi square tests indicate that there is a significant relationship between source of referral and fighting and verbal disagreement. When fighting is indicated as a cause of conflict teachers and "others" (principals and security personnel) are much more likely to be the referral source (chi square = 13.85, df=6, $p<.01$). When verbal disagreements are indicated as a cause of conflict, students and self referrals are more common (chi square = 12.12, df=6, $p<.05$). There was no relationship for property/money-related disputes or rumors.

Table 21
Source of Referral and Cause of Conflict

Source	Fighting-Yes	Fighting- No	Disagreement- Yes	Disagreement- No
teacher	11%	13%	17%	7%
student	5%	9%	11%	3%
counselor	8%	7%	11%	4%
NTA	1%	1%	1%	1%
self	4%	8%	10%	1%
other	25%	9%	16%	18%

Mediator Characteristics: The Good Shepherd model trains peer mediators to operate in co-mediation models. Data were analyzed in terms of the gender composition of the co-mediator teams. 11% of the co-mediator teams were male/male; 38% were female/female, 35% were male/female, and 16% were "other". This latter category mainly includes mediations where a single mediator, and usually an adult mediator, was used. No data are available on mediator grade. The gender composition of the mediator teams may be due to an attempt to match mediator gender and disputant gender.

Mediation Agreements: As indicated earlier, the vast majority of cases going to mediation end in agreement. From the school reported summary data the figures indicated earlier are approximately 90% agreement rate. Data from the mediation measures reports a slightly higher agreement rate of 96%. The discrepancy is clearly due to source of data and the lower agreement rate will be used in discussions of general findings.

Data from the mediation agreement sheets were content analyzed to discover the types of agreements being constructed. Four categories of agreement were identified. The first category, "general peacekeeping", which accounted for 60% of the mediation agreements in this study, included simple agreements where the disputants basically agree to "be friends" and cease disruptive behavior. The second category, "avoidance", includes

agreements where disputants state that they will actively avoid or stay away from the other party. 27% of the mediated agreements in this study fell into the second category. The third category, "restitution", which accounted for only 2% of the agreements, involve more complex agreements where one or both parties agree to actions that are explicitly retributive in this conflict (like repaying money owed, replacing property damaged, etc.). Finally, the fourth category, "future bargain", which accounted for only 1% of mediated agreements, involves parties agreeing to some future exchange of goods or behaviors should certain circumstances arise (e.g., if one party transgresses again the other party will receive a written apology).

Evaluation of Mediation Process and Outcome

Data from mediator and disputant debriefing forms supply information about the nature of the mediation process and the levels of satisfaction with both process and outcome. Data are reported in terms of mediator use of strategies and tactics, mediator satisfaction, disputant satisfaction, and disputant attitudes about mediation.

Mediator Process Evaluation: On the debriefing form, mediators were asked to respond to a series of nominal scale items that inquired about the use of certain strategies or tactics and whether the mediators felt they were helpful during mediation. The result for those questions are indicated in Table 22.

Table 22
Mediator Process Evaluation

Item	Yes	No	Not Sure
Did you or your co-mediator mention confidentiality in the opening statement?	97%	3%	
Did you and your co-mediator caucus with the parties?	83%	14%	3%
Did you or your co-mediator mention confidentiality in each of the caucuses?	77%	13%	3%
Did caucusing appear to help parties in reaching an agreement?	64%	19%	10%
Was there anything else the mediator could have done to aid the parties?	13%	65%	16%
Was there anything about this mediation that made it difficult to stay neutral?	14%	58%	3%
Based on this mediation is there anything that you would have liked to have learned more about in training?	12%	53%	5%
In looking back is there anything you wish you had done differently in this mediation?	17%	50%	5%

As the results suggest, the mediators usually used caucusing and explained confidentiality. They were fairly confident that they had been taught essential skills in training and that they had employed those skills well in the mediation. Although there

were some mediators who expressed a desire for more information or who felt that they could have done something differently in the mediation, the majority were pleased with the process.

Mediators were also asked to respond to four interval-level items measuring their satisfaction with the mediation and their assessments of the disputants' satisfaction with the process and outcome. A four point scale was used ranging from "1"-very satisfied, "2" -satisfied, "3" -unsatisfied, and "4" - very unsatisfied. **Thus, the lower the means on these scales the higher the degree of satisfaction.** The results and the items are indicated in Table 23.

Table 23
Mediator Satisfaction

Item	Very Sat.	Sat.	Unsat	Very Unsat	Not Sure	Mean	sd
How satisfied do you think the initiating party was when the mediation ended?	19%	53%	12%	2%	11%	2.30	1.15
How satisfied do you think the responding party was when mediation ended?	18%	48%	7%	5%	15%	2.47	1.30
How satisfied are you with the way the mediation went?	26%	33%	10%	4%	0%	1.96	1.01
How satisfied are you with the way you and your co-mediator worked together?	38%	28%	2%	3%	0%	1.63	.91

The mediators were most satisfied with the way they worked with their co-mediators. They were fairly satisfied with the way the mediation went, but were less optimistic with the disputants' satisfaction with mediation. However, they felt the initiating party was slightly more satisfied than the responding party.

Both mediator process evaluation and satisfaction data were further analyzed to determine whether mediator gender or school level was related to perceptions of process or satisfaction. No significant relationships were discovered.

Disputant Process Evaluation. The disputant debriefing form included several nominal scale items concerning mediation process. Those items and responses to them are presented in Table 24.

Table 24
Disputant Process Evaluation

Item	Yes	No	Not Sure

Did someone explain mediation before it took place?	92%	4%	3%
Did someone ask you if you were willing to go to mediation before it took place?	70%	25%	3%
Was your mediation held in a place that was private?	86%	10%	1%
Did the mediator explain what would happen in mediation before it started?	85%	6%	7%
Did the mediator explain that everything said in mediation would be kept confidential?	87%	4%	5%
Did you trust and believe the mediator?	84%	4%	7%
Did the mediator help you identify the problems to discuss during the mediation session?	84%	6%	5%
Did the mediator keep from taking sides with the other party?	75%	13%	5%
Did the mediator give you enough time to explain your side of the situation?	87%	2%	4%
Did the mediator listen to your ideas about how to settle the conflict?	88%	2%	5%
Did the mediator help you and the other party understand each other's point of view in the conflict?	84%	3%	7%

As the results show, disputants felt that they had willingly participated in mediation, and that the mediation process had been explained to them before and during mediation. Mediation was private and the mediators were trustworthy and helped disputants understand and solve their disputes. These data were also analyzed in terms of possible relationship with disputant gender, race, or school level. No significant relationships were identified.

In addition, disputants were asked to respond to four interval level items gauging satisfaction with mediation and their interest in using mediation again, recommending mediation to others, or becoming mediators themselves. These items ranged from very satisfied to very dissatisfied. **The lower the mean on these scales the higher the degree of satisfaction or interest.**

Table 25
Disputant Satisfaction

Item	Very Sat.	Sat.	Not Sure	Unsat.	Very UnSat	Mean	SD
How satisfied are you with the agreement that was reached?	38%	34%	12%	3%	3%	1.88	.99
Do you think that you would use mediation again?	32%	30%	17%	7%	9%	2.29	1.27
Do you think you would suggest mediation for other	43%	28%	20%	3%	3%	1.93	1.03

students who are involved in a conflict?							
Are you interested in training to be a mediator?	34%	24%	16%	7%	14%	2.42	1.42

The results of these items are very important. Clearly, disputants were not only satisfied with the agreements reached, they were very likely to use mediation again themselves and to recommend it to other students. A majority of the disputants even expressed an interest in becoming mediators based on this experience.

T-tests and ANOVAs were performed to discover whether there were significant differences in responses to these items based on disputant gender, party status, race, or school level. The only significant difference discovered concerned party status and the interest in using mediation again. Specifically, initiating parties ($M=1.74$) were significantly more likely than responding parties ($M= 2.58$) to report an interest in using mediation again ($t=3.20$, $df=71$, $p<.01$).

Factors Affecting Program Efficacy and Recommendations

This section draws from interview, questionnaire and observation information to summarize significant factors affecting the success of peer mediation programs and are used as a basis for recommendations.

Training:

The quality of the training experience was hailed by students and staff as one of the most important factors in the interest in and success of the peer mediation program. The general consensus was that the training clearly presents the concepts of mediation and conflict management and enables students and staff to understand and apply the concepts. Thus, respondents felt strongly that they had learned new ideas and behaviors. Not one respondent in the interviews indicated that s/he felt the training had been insufficient or ineffective in this regard.

Although not quantified, it is important to mention that interviewees felt strongly that they had learned new skills that were important in their self-esteem and their perception of control over their behavior and their lives. Many of the peer mediators interviewed were quite vocal about this change and felt it was something that had already had significant impact on their self-assessment.

Even though the training was well received, there were specific suggestions for improving future training sessions. Some of these suggestions indicate the need for change while others indicate the need to reinforce or enhance existing practice or approaches.

Emphasize experiential learning: Both students and staff indicated unanimously that the mediation role-plays and similar experiential learning techniques were the most

important contributor to their learning process. Several suggestions emerged about ways to maximize experiential learning processes.

1) Most students felt that even more attention should be given to increasing the use of role-plays, especially in the first two days of the training. Given the difficulty of providing mediators with actual mediation cases in some schools, the role-plays could be used as a training continuation tool after the initial training had ended. Several of the site coordinators and Good Shepherd liasions have already identified and used this option.

2) In addition, students felt that the topics of the role-plays could be more realistic or relevant to the kinds of conflicts they experience. Some students commented that the topics of current role-plays, such as "throwing a book out a window", was not something that they could relate to. Some students suggested letting the peer mediators generate their own role plays and then participate in them. It should be noted that the role-plays included in the training materials may have been purposefully designed as simple in order to allow students to concentrate on learning and applying mediation concepts in an "easier" type of dispute context.

3) In the current training the students are not always given an opportunity to watch a live role-play before participating in one. Although students are shown a short video with a mediation role-play, some students and staff suggested having the trainers act as mediators and mediate a role-play before asking students and staff to engage in one. Since most, if not all, of the trainers are certified as mediators in the community mediation program, they could easily role-play disputes, as some trainers currently do.

4) In a related comment, several students suggested increasing the use of alternate teaching approaches to help students with different learning styles. Incorporating dance, art, poems, etc., may increase the physical and mental involvement with the material. This could also enable students to express cultural interests through their selection of activities.

Decrease length of training. Although complaints about the training were rare, some comments expressed concern about the four consecutive days of training. Two main problems were identified. Staff, and especially teachers, felt that four days away from their other responsibilities were a significant hardship. They reported feeling anxious and torn about their other duties as well as concerned about their ability to handle the backlog when they returned. Some staff expressed a similar concern that four days away from their regular class work was not easy for the students either. The other major concern was that it was very difficult to sustain interest in any topic over four consecutive days. Both students and staff indicated that the "grind" was noticeable, even though they were truly interested in the training.

Changes in the training schedule would have to be coordinated with the financial and logistical realities of the schools. Specifically, schools have to arrange for substitute teacher coverage for participating teachers and staff. Extending training across several days is very difficult. Suggestions to radically reduce the overall number of hours of

training raise questions about the quality of training the students receive. The trainers feel it is very important to retain quality and that this requires at least 24 contact hours of training with the peer mediators.

Retain staff/student training mix: Students and staff felt very positively about the current model that trains staff and students together, as equals. Participants felt that it helped them identify with the others, helped reduce status barriers, and helped them feel more comfortable with each other as the peer mediation program progressed past training. Students were especially appreciative of the opportunity to role-play mediations with staff acting as peers in the dispute. Staff also appreciated these experiences, but often commented that they felt a need for clarification of their roles as the beginning of the training. They suggested that more time be spent explicitly indicating their responsibilities and functions in the training and explaining their status as true "peers".

Increase attention to specific skill practice: While participants are given an opportunity to prepare an initial statement and are provided with considerable feedback about writing agreements, many felt that similar or comparable specific skill practice and feedback was needed for other skills such as negotiation and brainstorming. Participants indicated that they felt comfortable starting and ending a mediation, but were not nearly as comfortable with what came in between. Skill practices in mini-role-plays would accommodate this need as well as emphasize experiential learning processes in general. It would also provide increased opportunities for different participants to interact.

Review training materials for age-appropriateness and cultural sensitivity: Although few, if any, students commented on this, several adults suggested rewriting sections of the training manual to make the language more accessible to younger students. This was particularly evident where participants included students as young as fifth and sixth grades. This suggestion was emphasized in light of the practice of asking participants to read aloud from the manual during training sessions.

Some students, more than adults, suggested altering the stories and examples in the manual to make the manual more multicultural in tone and content. Perhaps students should be encouraged to write their own mini-manuals to reflect their realities.

Consider including parents and community members in training. It is becoming more evident that the contexts in which the students live are not necessarily receptive to the conflict skills being practiced. Students often talk about their reluctance to discuss mediation or employ their skills outside of school with non-peers, especially family members. However, they are comfortable practicing mediation skills informally with their friends and peers outside of school activities. Inclusion of parents and other community members in training may help the larger social group understand mediation and the peer mediation program and may result in increased opportunities for students to practice and apply their conflict management skills.

Prepare students as trainers for upcoming training: One of the best ways to decrease costs, increase involvement, and maintain interest is to teach some peer mediators to assist in delivering training in subsequent semesters. The peer mediators were very excited by this possibility and felt that it would definitely increase their interest in staying with the program. It may also significantly increase their understanding of the mediation process and may increase self-esteem and social relaxation.

Publicity of Program:

One of the weakest components of the program was the means used and/or available to publicize the program and inform students, teachers, parents, and others about the nature of peer mediation. The need for better publicity and recruitment efforts was emphasized by every peer mediator group.

Improve recruitment efforts: The interviews revealed that recruitment efforts have been inconsistent. According to the agreement, each school should have a mandatory assembly in which the peer mediation program and its possible benefits are discussed. Yet, students and staff at the same schools sometimes disagreed about whether such recruitment assemblies had been provided or had included all students. Others suggested that, while assemblies had been held, the manner in which the information was delivered was less than effective in stimulating interest and commitment. Students had several suggestions for improving recruitment efforts.

1) In schools with existing programs, allow peer mediators to participate in and/or plan the recruitment assembly activities. The more the message is seen as coming from them, the more effective it will be.

2) Use multimedia opportunities for recruitment purposes. Some schools have internal television networks that allow the showing of videos throughout select classrooms. In addition to recruitment assemblies, more effort should be paid to using these supplements to produce a multimedia message. Use the existing print publications of the school, such as a school newspaper and/or yearbook. Once again, the more involved the students can be in developing and delivering these messages the more effective they will be.

3) Attempt to attract celebrities to participate in the videos and/or assemblies. Students felt that getting a local sports figure or celebrity would make a big difference in student responses.

4) Utilize school or community theater to present ideas about conflict and peer mediation. Good Shepherd has already encouraged such ideas by supporting Susan Turlish's production of A Safe Place. Dramatic material like this heightens interest, by making the presentation more entertaining and demonstrating the mediation process as it works to reduce violence or manage conflict.

5) Expand orientation sessions to staff to serve more as recruitment activities for staff participants. Little information has been collected about the nature and success of the orientation sessions for staff. The general procedure is to provide some orientation prior to conducting the peer mediation training so that teachers and staff understand the reasons for the training and the need for students to be involved. However, few staff participants remember the orientation sessions as effective. Some suggested that they did not remember having such a session.

Improve publicity quantity and quality: It is difficult for peer mediation programs to work well if the general student and staff population don't understand what it is and, thus, decide not to use. The already mentioned difficulties in recruitment are compounded by generally poor publicity efforts. While recruitment deficiencies may affect the number and nature of students interested in volunteering to be peer mediators, publicity deficiencies render the program almost useless in some schools. Students often commented that little or no publicity efforts were in place. As a result, some students felt that the school didn't really care about them and were not committed to the program. Moreover, they acknowledged that it made it more difficult to overcome some other students' cynicism about peer mediation and cooperative orientations to conflict. Staff often commented that most of the other school personnel had very little, if any, understanding of what peer mediation was or how or why to use it. Some specific recommendations to improve publicity efforts include:

1) Specify specific individuals to be responsible for publicity efforts and coordination. As in other cases, diffused responsibility often leads to no action. One suggestion offered was to develop a publicity team consisting of two or three of the peer mediators, one of the adult participants, and the Good Shepherd liaison. This team could be responsible for enacting some of the other suggestions offered and could serve as a liaison group for intergroup and interschool communication.

2) Follow the peer mediation training with a peer mediation assembly in which newly trained mediators could demonstrate the process and suggest appropriate referral mechanisms. Such assemblies may be full school assemblies in smaller schools. However, they may work better as more targeted and intimate interactions, such as home room assemblies or house assemblies, where students could talk with peers they know after the demonstrations.

3) Making a "home movie" of the training experience available for the school television channel or putting together a snapshot poster showing training situations would make the reality more concrete and, hopefully, more attractive.

4) Making signs and regular announcements or postings about the program is one of the easiest, least expensive, and most effective ways to keep the program fresh in people's minds. From Xeroxed flyers posted in the halls to laminated posters placed in each classroom, these materials could remind people of the program, when it is useful and how to refer students. Similar materials could reinforce basic notions of cooperation and

collaboration. These signs and posters would also provide an opportunity to allow students to express their cultural interests through the art, language, etc., on the materials.

5) Provide peer mediators and staff participants an opportunity to meet their counterparts from other programs. The students were especially intrigued with the idea of talking with other peer mediators. Several students expressed a newfound sense of importance and involvement just knowing that similar programs were being started at other schools.

6) Devise ways to publicize programs in the local communities so that parents and community members know of its presence. It is difficult to suggests only one or two mechanisms for this because of the variety of ways that schools use to communicate with parents and community members/organizations. However, one of the charges of the recommended "publicity team" should be to examine existing school/community links and to use those whenever possible. Printed material is most efficient, so emphasis should be placed on local newspapers, flyers, letters to parents, posters in store windows, etc.

Program Design and Implementation:

One of the strengths and weaknesses of the programs included in this evaluation was the variety of ways the general program design suggested by Good Shepherd was actually being implemented. This necessitates a discussion of administrative support, timing, staffing, student selection, supervision/coordination of program and continuing relationship with Good Shepherd.

Secure administrative support and participation: The data strongly suggest that program success is significantly affected by the degree and nature of administrative support for the program. In many cases all else (e.g., needed resources, proper staffing, community outreach, etc.) ultimately depends on this. While it may be possible to have a successful peer mediation program without strong administrative support, it is certainly much more difficult and time consuming. Moreover, it increases the chances for failure and, thus, for disappointing and demotivating interested students and creating distrust among students and staff for similar initiatives.

1) Insist that school administrators take part in mediation training. Although taking time from their schedules is difficult, all administrators signing an agreement for the program should be willing to participate in the majority of the training.

2) Target schools where administrative support comes from more than one person. Ideally, the principal and at least one assistant or vice-principal should be identified to operate as an administrative support base. These people may be in addition to the other adult participants involved in the program. The broader the base of administrative support, the less chance that the program will be negatively impacted by administrative turnover, an especially common problem during this evaluation period.

3) Negotiate necessary resources with administrators prior to training. Although appropriate/adequate space for mediation and mediation training is included in the agreement, several programs were not supplied with these resources. In one case, mediations were actually allowed to be conducted in the halls of a busy high school. In others, students were shuffled from room to room to conduct the mediation sessions. And, in those cases, peer mediators, site coordinators and Good Shepherd liaisons often found it difficult to locate space for their weekly or bi-weekly sessions.

Insist on training in fall semester: This recommendation is difficult to follow, although critical for increasing the chances for program success. Given the current resource situation (including schools' abilities to pay, to find time for training, and the training capacity of the training provider), it is very difficult to restrict training to fall semester. However, it should be attempted in the future. Additional funding would have to be secured in order for Good Shepherd to provide all training in the fall. But, this would allow schools to have a full year to devote to the program. This is especially critical for schools receiving their first training. Given this time, the program can develop, referrals may increase, mediators have more experience and, hopefully, more commitment to the program, and staff have more opportunity to become comfortable with the program.

The data suggest that training and program implementation should not be conducted after March at the very latest. The programs that received training as late as March and even April did not fare well. Students reported feeling depressed that they were not given the opportunity to use their skills. Most of the peer mediators trained in these programs expressed apprehension about continuing with the program in the fall semester. Conversely, students who received training in the fall usually reported a much stronger sense of satisfaction and continuing commitment to the program.

Insist on certain staffing processes: The adult participants play a very important role in the peer mediation program. They are responsible for motivating, modeling, and monitoring so that students can have a positive and educational experience. As a result, selection, education, and support of staff are critical to program success. There are several recommendations that arise from the data:

1) Attempt to involve more male staff in the programs. As the data indicate, the majority of staff are women. Young males need to see male role models who believe in and demonstrate the importance of mediation and collaborative conflict resolution.

2) Staff should be representative of various cultural groups. Obviously, someone's race, ethnicity, religion, etc., is not sufficient reason to select them for participation in this program. However, when there is a choice between equally motivated staff, it is better to pick staff who represent the various cultures of the school.

3) Staff should be representative of various functions within the schools. Staffing usually depends upon the size and complexity of the school involved. For smaller schools, it is preferable to have staff groups composed of teachers, counselors, NTAs/security

personnel, and administrators. For larger schools, or schools using more complex internal structures like house programs, it is essential to select staff who are key to the everyday operation of those units. For example, in schools using the house structure, the involvement of the house director and/or his/her assistants in the peer mediation program was important for success. There are some cases, such as these, where it is probably more important to include these personnel rather than teachers as training participants.

4) Staff should be given a separate orientation session prior to training. The current process used to implement the training and the peer mediation program is that administrators select staff who then show up on the first day of training. In some cases the trainers have had the opportunity to meet them before. In very few cases have the trainers had the opportunity to provide a separate orientation to the staff involved. Insisting on a staff orientation prior to training is important for the following reasons:

a) It would enable the trainers to assess the levels of interest and commitment among the staff.
b) It would require administrators to plan ahead and attend more carefully to staffing decisions.
c) It would clarify their purpose and function to the staff. Several staff members suggested that they were never quite sure why they were there and what they were supposed to be doing, either during or after training.
d) It would enable Good Shepherd to identify staff whose participation may be more negative than positive. They could then suggest alternatives. In some extreme cases they may even refuse to conduct training with the current staff configurations.

Clarify selection processes for peer mediators: Overall, the students selected as peer mediators appear to be good choices and seem to represent a number of cultural and developmental levels. However, it is clear that there is no standardized process used to select peer mediators. Some schools apparently hand-pick students and simply tell them to show up for training. In these situations the students may be uninterested or completely uninformed about what they are becoming involved in. Other schools asked for volunteers and then selected a smaller group from among those who volunteered. Other schools apparently used little, if any, screening.

1) Whatever selection process is used, participation in the training and the program should always be voluntary.

2) Selection processes should exclude students with certain difficulties such as low attendance, severely violent behavior, substance abuse problems, etc.

3) Students interested in volunteering should be given a brief orientation session to explain, in more detail, the nature of the program prior to training. A 15 to 30 minute meeting after or before school would be sufficient.

Improve Coordination and Supervision of Program: Once training has been completed, programs face a number of forces that act to inhibit the effectiveness of the program. There are a number of specific recommendations that pertain to the role of the site coordinator, the Good Shepherd liaison and the internal administrative structure and practices of the staff.

The role of the site coordinator and the Good Shepherd liaison needs to be clarified for staff and students. The interview data strongly suggested that the peer mediation program participants were often unable to explain the nature and role of the Good Shepherd liaison. Several people mentioned that they did not know that such people existed and looked forward to being able to have that support provided.

1) Perhaps an initial place to start is to have the site coordinators and liaisons themselves talk about what they want that role to be and how they prefer to operate in the post-training role. Some collaboration may result from continuing clarification of the role and its process.

2) The role should be clearly communicated in writing to administration, staff, and students involved in the program. They should be able to have a written guideline for their expectations of and their responsibilities to the site coordinator and liaison.

The lack of internal supervision in the peer mediation programs is one of the greatest weaknesses. There needs to be someone "in charge" of the program who can oversee referral and intake processes, record keeping, and serve as a support person and contact for the Good Shepherd liaison and administration. In short, someone who makes sure that nothing falls between the cracks. This "middle manager" position is extremely important and must be performed by someone in the school. Although some schools have come close, the model suggested here has not been maximally effective in any of the programs studied thus far.

1) Prior to training, identify (with the aid of the principal and others) the person who will act in this capacity. Explain the nature of the responsibilities and provide whatever additional, and possibly, separate orientation is necessary.

2) Provide these "managers" an opportunity to trade information with others in their same positions. They could exchange best practices through written summaries or brief meetings.

3) Provide "managers" with "user friendly" record-keeping systems that will enable them to keep track of intake, referrals, questionnaires, etc.

Summary and Future Research Concerns

Based on the information collected thus far, this report suggests a successful initial experience for the peer mediation program. However, as stated earlier, this conclusion is offered cautiously and should be understood as only indicative of trends at this stage. In terms of the stated goals of the peer mediation program, the following can be stated:

1. Institutionalization of peer mediation in the Philadelphia Public Schools. To date the program is on target (actually slightly ahead of target) in terms of the number of schools involved in the program. The vast majority of participating schools are living up to their agreements and provided promised resources and support; although there is considerable variation in program quality.

However, there are specific questions that need to be addressed in the next year's evaluation study that were not considered given the stage of development during the 1992-1994 period.

Continuation of programs: In Spring 1994 the Phase I schools were officially "weaned" to continue the programs on their own. Each school had an exit interview with the Good Shepherd and School District Personnel. Part of that exit interview was the discussion of a tentative action plan for the school to follow in the upcoming year. Data collection should address the extent to which schools continue to support the peer mediation programs in terms of training continuation, quality of training, resource provision, and maintenance/expansion of mediation use.

Degree of Interest in Other Schools: Given the extent of the program it is important to determine the "word of mouth" publicity and interest in other schools. A relatively simple survey will be distributed to other middle and senior high schools not currently involved.

General Evaluation Survey of Continuing Programs: It will also be important to obtain quantitative data from administrators of participating schools in terms of their assessment of the overall success and impact of the peer mediation program. Based on information generated from the qualitative interviews discussed here, a survey instrument will be developed and administered at the end of each semester.

Awareness Survey: As mentioned earlier, one of the improvement areas noted throughout the current study is program publicity and general awareness of the program by teachers and students not directly involved. A simple survey instrument is being developed for administration to a random sample of students and teachers in participating programs.

2. Decrease incidents of violence. At this point there has been no specific data collection to address the impact of peer mediation on incidents of violent activity in the schools. Data

on violent behavior is not easy to obtain from the school system. Attempts will be made to increase data collection in this area. Specifically, attempts will be made to obtain the following information:

Incidence of violence by peer mediators: Participating schools will be asked to maintain records of violent activity for students involved as mediators before and after their exposure to training.

Incidence of violence by disputants: Similarly, participating schools will be asked to maintain records of violent activity for students involved as disputants in peer mediation. Comparisons of before and after data may indicate whether peer mediation has some influence. Selected samples for surveys may also be possible.

General Incidence of Violence For School: Given the complexity of violence it is not realistic to expect one program to causally determine levels of violence in a school or district. However, some association may be evident. Schools will be asked to keep records of types and frequency of violent acts for comparative purposes.

3. Offer an alternative to suspensions and expulsions. This area is similar to goal #2. Similar measures will be employed.

Suspension/Expulsion rates for peer mediators: Data for these variables will be requested from participating schools for students involved as peer mediators.

Suspension/Expulsion rates for disputants: Data for disputants involved in peer mediation will also be requested.

General Incidence of Suspension/Expulsion rates for School: General trend information will be recorded.

4. Improve school attendance. Data for this goal will approximate data collected for goals #2 and 3.

Attendance Rates for Peer Mediators: Data for these variables will be requested from participating schools for students involved as peer mediators.

Attendance Rates for Disputants: Data for disputants involved in peer mediation will also be requested.

General Attendance Rates for School: General trend information will be recorded.

5. To provide students and teachers with the communication, interpersonal, leadership, problem-solving, and other conflict-management skills associated with mediation. The majority of attention has been given to this goal. The results of the study

thus far support the achievement of this goal. Specifically, program participants feel they are learning new skills in training. Behavioral assessments in role-plays support the training efficacy. And, information from mediation sessions suggests that the mediators are satisfied with mediation process and outcomes, as are disputants. In addition to the continuation of measures currently in use, attempts will be made to obtain the following data during the next evaluation period.

Content Analyses of Actual Mediation: Although there may be some difficulty in terms of access, it is important for data to be collected that measures the actual use of conflict management and mediation skills in the mediation sessions. This information will shed light on the validity of the self-report data currently collected.

Assessment of Student Trainers' Abilities: One measure of knowledge is the ability to teach. Given the interest in having peer mediators act as trainers or training assistants, the opportunity exists for observation and analysis of their ability to disseminate this information to peers.

Mediation Follow-Up: Data needs to be collected about the long-term satisfaction with the mediation process and outcome and the ability of the agreements to stand the test of time.

Interpersonal Conflict Competence for Mediators and Disputants: An adaptation of the self-report version of the Selman INS instrument (or some similar measure) should be distributed to peer mediators longitudinally to determine their changing orientations to conflict. This instrument may also be used to determine whether students are differentially competent given changes in the relational, cultural, or social context of the dispute.

Interpersonal Conflict Competence for teachers: Little attention has been given to whether exposure to the peer mediation program alters the teacher's or staff member's orientations to conflict. More attention should be given to changes in disciplinary activity and general conflict competence for adult participants of the program.

Appendix A

Interview Schedules

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
A Commonwealth University

School of Communications and Theater
Department of Rhetoric and Communication

Weiss Hall, 265-65
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

Date

Dear :

Cheryl Cutrona and DeVonne Coleman-White of the Good Shepherd Neighborhood House have asked me to oversee a project to evaluate the peer mediation programs that Good Shepherd has been involved with in the Philadelphia Public Schools. We have been working together for the past year to research the effectiveness of the peer mediation training and the peer mediation programs. The goal of our evaluation is to identify factors that increase the chances for program effectiveness. The information gathered from this project will help in designing training programs for peer mediators and may even aid schools in getting support for similar efforts.

I am writing to ask you and members of your school who are participating in the peer mediation program to be interviewed as a part of our project. Last year we interviewed participants from the eight schools that received training. This year we are hoping to interview participants from the eleven schools trained by Good Shepherd.

There are three interviews involved:

- The first is a group interview with a small number (6-8) of the peer mediators. This interview usually lasts 30-45 minutes. Ideally, the peer mediators you select to participate should be representative of the whole group in terms of grade, gender, etc.

- We would also like to talk with a group of the staff members who received training and have been involved in the program. Again, this interview usually lasts about 30 minutes.

- And, we would like an individual interview with you or the administrator most responsible for the initiation and maintenance of the peer mediation program.

The questions that we ask of students and staff members are attached to this letter for your review. The interviews will be conducted by two members of the research group from the Dept. of Rhetoric and Communication at Temple (Diane Carlin, Meredith Symkowiak, Vicki Petraglia, Ivy Harris, Kathy Mittman, Manny Hernandez, Rebecca Postupak, Marlene Deas, Marisol Sequinot and myself). We appreciate your willingness to let us audiotape the interviews to aid us in accurately recording responses. Of course, the

audiotapes are only used by members of the research group for the purposes of this study. If anyone prefers not to be audiotaped their wishes will be respected.

We are hoping to schedule the interviews during the period of May 6 through May 13. You will be receiving a call from me or Diane Carlin in the beginning of the week of May 2 to talk further about possible interview times.

Please feel free to call me for more information about the evaluation or to contact Cheryl or DeVonne at Good Shepherd. I can be reached at the following numbers: 204-7261(w), 610-429-1121(h), 204-8543(fax). My doctoral assistant, Diane Carlin can be reached at 649-2269.

I look forward to talking with you next week.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tricia S. Jones
Chair and Associate Professor

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
A Commonwealth University

School of Communications and Theater
Department of Rhetoric and Communication

Weiss Hall, 265-65
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

March 22, 1994

Dear Teacher, Staff Person and Administrator:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this evaluation of the peer mediation program at your school. Good Shepherd Neighborhood House has asked Dr. Tricia Jones of the Department of Rhetoric and Communication to conduct an evaluation of the peer mediation programs they are involved with. Dr. Jones and other members of the evaluation team (Diane Carlin, Marisol Sequinot, Ivy Harris, Manny Hernadez, Vicki Petraglia, Norris Bacon, Kathy Mittman, Marlene Deas, Meredith Symkowiak, Rebecca Postupak) will be talking with teachers, staff, and administrators involved in establishing and overseeing peer mediation efforts.

The purpose of the evaluation is to see whether the peer mediation programs are having desired results in terms of students'orientations to conflict. The information gathered from this project will help in designing training programs for peer mediators and may even aid schools in getting support for similar efforts.

All information gathered in this study is treated as confidential and anonymity is protected. The final report will discuss the general trends and findings, but individual's comments will not be identified. Each school participating in the peer mediation program will receive a copy of the final evaluation report.

Please feel free to ask any questions about this evaluation project now or later. If for any reason you wish to contact someone after this interview please write Dr. Tricia Jones, 265-65 Weiss Hall, Dept. of Rhetoric & Communication, Temple University, Phila., Pa. 19122 or call (215)204-7261.

I have read and understand the information presented above and agree to participate in this study.

NAME:

POSITION:

SCHOOL:

DATE:

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
A Commonwealth University

School of Communications and Theater
Department of Rhetoric and Communication

Weiss Hall, 265-65
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

PEER MEDIATION'S CONSENT FORM

SCHOOL:

DATE:

INTERVIEWER:

All of the students listed below have agreed to talk with representatives of the Department of Rhetoric and Communication in their study of the peer mediation program at this school. The students understand that their comments will be treated with confidentiality. The results of the study will be discussed in terms of general trends and findings rather than an individual's comments about a particular school or event. Each school will receive a copy of the final project report when it is completed.

NAME (please print) SIGNATURE

Interview Schedule
Peer Mediation Project

For Teachers and Administrators:

School:
Date:
Interviewer:
Interviewee(s):

1. What motivated you and the school to become involved in the peer mediation program?

2. Can you give a brief history of how and when the program started here at ———?

3. Initially, what did you hope the program would accomplish? (what initial goals did you have?)

    - what do you think others hoped the program would accomplish?

4. Did you participate in or observe the initial training of the children and/or the teachers? What were your impressions of the training program?

    - what aspects of the training were you impressed with?
    - what could be done to strengthen the training?
    - if you didn't participate in training, what prevented you?

5. What has the program accomplished so far?

    - How well would you say it has achieved the goals of (decreasing violence, decreasing suspensions and expulsions, improving children's conflict skills)

6. What has the program not accomplished that you had hoped it would?

7. What factors have contributed to the success of the program?

8. What factors have inhibited the success of the program?

9. From the students point of view, how positive or negative has this experience been for them?

    - from the teacher's point of view?
    - from the administrator's point of view?

10. What have you learned from this experience that you would give as advice to someone else who wanted to start a peer mediation program in their school?

11. What do you see as an administrator's role in insuring the success of a peer mediation program?

    - what support do you need from administrators, teachers or parents to secure the success of the program?

Focus Group Interview Schedule
Peer Mediators
Peer Mediation Project

School:

Date:
Interviewer:
Children (Attach consent form sheet for children's names)

1. Tell me why you decided to become a peer mediator.

2. Before the peer mediation program what did you do when you were having a conflict with:

-friends
-other kids
-teachers
-brother and sisters

3. Tell me what you did in the training sessions to become a peer mediator.

-what was really helpful?
-what wasn't?

4. What did you learn from the peer mediation program that has changed the way you handle conflict now?

5. What are the important skills someone needs to know to handle conflict more effectively?

6. As a peer mediator how did other students respond when you tried to help them solve their conflicts?

-what problems have you had in getting people to refer conflicts to peer mediation?

7. In general, what do the other kids think of the peer mediators and the whole idea of the peer mediation program?

8. What do the teachers think of the program?

9. How have your parents or family members responded to you since you've been a peer mediator?

-do you try and use your mediation skills at home?
-if so, how have they worked?
-if not, why not?

10. What would tell other kids interested in becoming peer mediators?

Appendix B

Observation Notes and Content Analysis System

OBSERVATION PACKET **Observer** _____
Peer Mediation Project
Temple 1993-1994

Date of Observation: _____

School: _____

Times: _____ Day of Training: 1 2 3 4

Trainers: _____

_____

_____

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS: Complete this information for observations on Day 1 training.

1. Adult Participants (For each adult, non-trainer participant please complete the following information):

P1: Sex M or F
Race AA C H NA AsA U O_____
Position T NTA Ad U O _____

P2: Sex M or F
Race AA C H NA AsA U O_____
Position T NTA Ad U O _____

P3: Sex M or F
Race AA C H NA AsA U O_____
Position T NTA Ad U O _____

P4: Sex M or F
Race AA C H NA AsA U O_____
Position T NTA Ad U O _____

2. Student Participants (Indicate the number of student participants that fall into each of the following categories):

	AA	C	H	NA	AsA	O	TOTAL
Male:							
G	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
G	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
G	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Overall	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Female:							
G	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
G	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
G	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Overall	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

FIELD NOTES

Please note any striking behavior or interaction with particular emphasis on the following categories:

Physical Environment:

Incidents of Fighting/Aggression:

Incidents of Constructive Conflict Management:

Level of Participant Involvement in Training:

Expertise of Trainers (Substantive, Ability to Communicate Concepts to Students):

Classroom Control (Degree of control mainted by trainers, level of discipline):

Interactions Between Students and NonTrainer Adults:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other Observations:

Theoretical Notes:

Methodological Notes:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ROLE PLAY OBSERVATION SHEET

Mediator 1: Sex _____ Race _____ Grade _____ Pos _____

Mediator 2: Sex _____ Race _____ Grade _____ Pos _____

Disputant 1: Sex _____ Race _____ Grade _____ Pos _____

Disputant 2: Sex _____ Race _____ Grade _____ Pos _____

Topic of Dispute _____

Day of Training 1 2 3 4 morning afternoon

For each of the following stages of the mediation process, indicate whether you think the skills were performed very well to very poorly on a scale of 1 to 5 (i.e., very well = 5, well = 4, medium = 3, poorly = 2, very poorly = 1). Also, please comment specifically on the reasons you rated as you did. Note the specific behaviors that were or were not performed adequately. Use checklists for guidance and prompting.

OPENING STATEMENT:

Introductions	1	2	3	4	5
Description	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation	1	2	3	4	5
Rules	1	2	3	4	5
Confidentiality	1	2	3	4	5
Summarize	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

FACT-FINDING

Gather Info	1	2	3	4	5
Maintain Rules	1	2	3	4	5
Listening	1	2	3	4	5
Summarizing	1	2	3	4	5
Interests	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

CAUCUSING: Were caucuses used? yes no

Explanation	1	2	3	4	5
Gather Info	1	2	3	4	5
Summarization	1	2	3	4	5
Appropriate	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

FINDING SOLUTIONS:

Brainstorming	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluating	1	2	3	4	5
Bargaining	1	2	3	4	5
Identifying	1	2	3	4	5
Summarizing	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:

Appendix C

Quantitative Measures

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
STUDENT TRAINING EVALUATION

Your feedback on this mediation training is very important to us.

1. Student ID: _____ 2. Your school: _____

3. Your age: (years) _____ 4. Your grade: (5-12) _____

5. Your sex: (check one)

☐ Female ☐ Male

6. Your race: (check one)

☐ African American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Inter-racial describe: _____ ☐ Other describe: _____

☐ Asian ☐ Hispanic

Use this scale to rate how much you agree with each of the following statements:

SA = Strongly Agree (YES!)
A = Agree (yes)
U = Undecided (?)
D = Disagree (no)
SD = Strongly Disagree (NO!)

Circle one response for each.

7. The training manuals were easy to follow.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. The training manuals covered all information I needed about mediation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. The mediation trainers explained all mediation procedures clearly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. The mediation trainers answered all questions to my satisfaction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. The mediation trainers provided opportunities for persons to express their views about mediation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. The mediation trainers gained my trust and confidence.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. In general, the training included enough time to practice skills in resolving conflict.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. In general, the training enhanced my skills for resolving conflicts.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. In general, the training met my needs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. The training did a good job of preparing me tomediate conflicts.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Use this scale to rate how helpful the training was in explaining each of the following topics:

VH = Very Helpful
H = Helpful
NH = Not Helpful
? = Can't Remember
NA = Not Applicable (it was definitely not covered).

Circle one response for each.

17. Basic terms and definitions	VH	H	NH	?	NA
18. Difference between adjudication and mediation	VH	H	NH	?	NA
19. Qualities of a good mediator	VH	H	NH	?	NA
20. Co-mediation	VH	H	NH	?	NA
21. Confidentiality	VH	H	NH	?	NA
22. Neutrality	VH	H	NH	?	NA
23. Opening statement	VH	H	NH	?	NA
24. Fact-finding skills	VH	H	NH	?	NA
25. Listening skills	VH	H	NH	?	NA
26. Caucusing	VH	H	NH	?	NA
27. Brainstorming	VH	H	NH	?	NA
28. Evaluating options	VH	H	NH	?	NA
29. Bargaining	VH	H	NH	?	NA
30. Agreement writing	VH	H	NH	?	NA
31. Closing statement	VH	H	NH	?	NA
32. Roleplays	VH	H	NH	?	NA
33. Ethical issues and special situations	VH	H	NH	?	NA
34. Legal principles	VH	H	NH	?	NA

35. Was there anything not covered in training that you would have liked to see covered?

_____

_____

_____

36. How you would improve the training. _____

_____

_____

_____

© 1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
STAFF TRAINING EVALUATION

Your feedback on this mediation training is very important to us.

1. Staff ID: _____ 2. Your school: _____

3. Your age: (years) _____ 4. Your job title: _____

5. Your sex: (check one)

☐ Female ☐ Male

6. Your race: (check one)

☐ African American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Inter-racial describe: _____ ☐ Other describe: _____

☐ Asian ☐ Hispanic

Use this scale to rate how much you agree with each of the following statements:

SA = Strongly Agree (YES!)
A = Agree (yes)
U = Undecided (?)
D = Disagree (no)
SD = Strongly Disagree (NO!)

Circle one response for each.

7. The training manuals were easy to follow.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. The training manuals covered all information I needed about mediation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. The mediation trainers explained all mediation procedures clearly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. The mediation trainers answered all questions to my satisfaction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. The mediation trainers provided opportunities for persons to express their views about mediation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. The mediation trainers gained my trust and confidence.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. In general, the training included enough time to practice skills in resolving conflict.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. In general, the training enhanced my skills for resolving conflicts.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. In general, the training met my needs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. The training did a good job of preparing me tomediate conflicts.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Use this scale to rate how helpful the training was in explaining each of the following topics:

VH = Very Helpful
H = Helpful
NH = Not Helpful
? = Can't Remember
NA = Not Applicable (it was definitely not covered).

Circle one response for each.

17. Basic terms and definitions	VH	H	NH	?	NA
18. Difference between adjudication and mediation	VH	H	NH	?	NA
19. Qualities of a good mediator	VH	H	NH	?	NA
20. Co-mediation	VH	H	NH	?	NA
21. Confidentiality	VH	H	NH	?	NA
22. Neutrality	VH	H	NH	?	NA
23. Opening statement	VH	H	NH	?	NA
24. Fact-finding skills	VH	H	NH	?	NA
25. Listening skills	VH	H	NH	?	NA
26. Caucusing	VH	H	NH	?	NA
27. Brainstorming	VH	H	NH	?	NA
28. Evaluating options	VH	H	NH	?	NA
29. Bargaining	VH	H	NH	?	NA
30. Agreement writing	VH	H	NH	?	NA
31. Closing statement	VH	H	NH	?	NA
32. Roleplays	VH	H	NH	?	NA
33. Ethical issues and special situations	VH	H	NH	?	NA
34. Legal principles	VH	H	NH	?	NA

35. Was there anything not covered in training that you would have liked to see covered?

_____

_____

_____

36. How you would improve the training. _____

_____

_____

_____

© 1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
PRE-TRAINING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF

1. Staff ID: _____ 2. Your school: _____

3. Your age: (years) _____ 4. Your job title: _____

5. Your sex: (check one)

☐ Female ☐ Male

6. Your race: (check one)

☐ African-American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Inter-racial: describe _____ ☐ Other: describe _____

☐ Asian ☐ Hispanic

Below are several questions related to conflict. By conflict, we mean any kind of physical fight (hitting or punching) or verbal disagreement (talking or shouting) or dispute that people sometimes get involved in.

7. About how many conflicts have you BEEN INVOLVED IN at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

8. About how many conflicts have you HELPED SETTLE (*resolve*) at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

Please complete the following sentences with the first words that come to your mind.

9. When I think about conflict, I _____

_____

10. I think that most conflicts are caused by _____

_____

11. People could stop conflict if they _____

_____

12. When I get angry, I _____

_____

13. I think that peer mediation is _____

_____

(over)

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

Please answer the following questions in terms of how you feel about conflict. When you answer, use the following scale:

SA = Strongly Agree (YES!)
A = Agree (yes)
U = Undecided (?)
D = Disagree (no)
SD = Strongly Disagree (NO!)

14. I'd rather avoid a conflict than face it and confront the other person.

SA A U D SD

15. When people have conflicts they should try to work with the other person to solve it.

SA A U D SD

16. Physical fighting is an effective way to deal with a conflict.

SA A U D SD

17. I let my friends influence the way I handle conflicts.

SA A U D SD

18. Overall, I think I handle conflict effectively.

SA A U D SD

Please answer the following questions in your own words.

19. Describe a conflict that is common in your school: _____

_____

20. Describe how you would help resolve the conflict you just mentioned above: _____

_____

21. List two kinds of situations which you would have trouble *not* talking about (keeping confidential):

a. _____

b. _____

22. List two kinds of situations in which you would have trouble *not* taking sides (staying neutral):

a. _____

b. _____

23. List three skills that you think are important or necessary to be a good mediator:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

24. Why do you want to be involved in the peer mediation program? _____

_____

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
POST-TRAINING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF

1. Staff ID: _____ 2. Your school: _____

3. Your age: (years) _____ 4. Your job title: _____

5. Your sex: (check one)

☐ Female ☐ Male

6. Your race: (check one)

☐ African-American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Inter-racial: describe _____ ☐ Other: describe _____

☐ Asian ☐ Hispanic

Below are several questions related to conflict. By conflict, we mean any kind of physical fight (hitting or punching) or verbal disagreement (talking or shouting) or dispute that people sometimes get involved in.

7. About how many conflicts have you BEEN INVOLVED IN at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

8. About how many conflicts have you HELPED SETTLE (*resolve*) at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

Please complete the following sentences with the first words that come to your mind.

9. When I think about conflict, I _____

_____

10. I think that most conflicts are caused by _____

_____

11. People could stop conflict if they _____

_____

12. When I get angry, I _____

_____

13. I think that peer mediation is _____

_____

(over)

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

Please answer the following questions in terms of how you feel about conflict. When you answer, use the following scale:

SA = Strongly Agree (YES!)
A = Agree (yes)
U = Undecided (?)
D = Disagree (no)
SD = Strongly Disagree (NO!)

14. I'd rather avoid a conflict than face it and confront the other person.

SA A U D SD

15. When people have conflicts they should try to work with the other person to solve it.

SA A U D SD

16. Physical fighting is an effective way to deal with a conflict.

SA A U D SD

17. I let my friends influence the way I handle conflicts.

SA A U D SD

18. Overall, I think I handle conflict effectively.

SA A U D SD

Please answer the following questions in your own words.

19. Describe a conflict that is common in your school: _____

_____

20. Describe how you would help resolve the conflict you just mentioned above: _____

_____

21. List two kinds of situations which you would have trouble *not* talking about (keeping confidential):

a. _____

b. _____

22. List two kinds of situations in which you would have trouble *not* taking sides (staying neutral):

a. _____

b. _____

23. List three skills that you think are important or necessary to be a good mediator:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

24. Why do you want to be involved in the peer mediation program? _____

_____

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
PRE-TRAINING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

1. Student ID: _____ 2. Your school: _____

3. Your age: (years) _____ 4. Your grade: (5-12) _____

5. Your sex: (check one)

☐ Female ☐ Male

6. Your race: (check one)

☐ African-American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Inter-racial: describe _____ ☐ Other: describe _____

☐ Asian ☐ Hispanic

Below are several questions related to conflict. By conflict, we mean any kind of physical fight (hitting or punching) or verbal disagreement (talking or shouting) or dispute that people sometimes get involved in.

7. About how many conflicts have you BEEN INVOLVED IN at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

8. About how many conflicts have you HELPED SETTLE (*resolve*) at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

Please complete the following sentences with the first words that come to your mind.

9. When I think about conflict, I _____

_____

10. I think that most conflicts are caused by _____

_____

11. People could stop conflict if they _____

_____

12. When I get angry, I _____

_____

13. I think that peer mediation is _____

_____

(over)

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

Please answer the following questions in terms of how you feel about conflict. When you answer, use the following scale:

SA = Strongly Agree (YES!)
A = Agree (yes)
U = Undecided (?)
D = Disagree (no)
SD = Strongly Disagree (NO!)

14. I'd rather avoid a conflict than face it and confront the other person.

SA A U D SD

15. When people have conflicts they should try to work with the other person to solve it.

SA A U D SD

16. Physical fighting is an effective way to deal with a conflict.

SA A U D SD

17. I let my friends influence the way I handle conflicts.

SA A U D SD

18. Overall, I think I handle conflict effectively.

SA A U D SD

Please answer the following questions in your own words.

19. Describe a conflict that is common in your school: _____

_____

20. Describe how you would help resolve the conflict you just mentioned above: _____

_____

21. List two kinds of situations which you would have trouble *not* talking about (keeping confidential):

a. _____

b. _____

22. List two kinds of situations in which you would have trouble *not* taking sides (staying neutral):

a. _____

b. _____

23. List three skills that you think are important or necessary to be a good mediator:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

24. Why do you want to be a peer mediator? _____

_____

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
POST-TRAINING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

1. Student ID: _____ 2. Your school: _____

3. Your age: (years) _____ 4. Your grade: (5-12) _____

5. Your sex: (check one)

☐ Female ☐ Male

6. Your race: (check one)

☐ African-American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Hispanic ☐ Inter-racial: describe _____ ☐ Other: describe _____

☐ Asian

Below are several questions related to conflict. By conflict, we mean any kind of physical fight (hitting or punching) or verbal disagreement (talking or shouting) or dispute that people sometimes get involved in.

7. About how many conflicts have you BEEN INVOLVED IN at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

8. About how many conflicts have you HELPED SETTLE (*resolve*) at school during the last month? (check one)

☐ 0 ☐ 1-2 ☐ 3-4 ☐ 5 or more

Please complete the following sentences with the first words that come to your mind.

9. When I think about conflict, I _____

_____

10. I think that most conflicts are caused by _____

_____

11. People could stop conflict if they _____

_____

12. When I get angry, I _____

_____

13. I think that peer mediation is _____

_____

(over)

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

Please answer the following questions in terms of how you feel about conflict. When you answer, use the following scale:

SA = Strongly Agree (YES!)
A = Agree (yes)
U = Undecided (?)
D = Disagree (no)
SD = Strongly Disagree (NO!)

14. I'd rather avoid a conflict than face it and confront the other person.

SA A U D SD

15. When people have conflicts they should try to work with the other person to solve it.

SA A U D SD

16. Physical fighting is an effective way to deal with a conflict.

SA A U D SD

17. I let my friends influence the way I handle conflicts.

SA A U D SD

18. Overall, I think I handle conflict effectively.

SA A U D SD

Please answer the following questions in your own words.

19. Describe a conflict that is common in your school: _____

_____

20. Describe how you would help resolve the conflict you just mentioned above: _____

_____

21. List two kinds of situations which you would have trouble *not* talking about (keeping confidential):

a. _____

b. _____

22. List two kinds of situations in which you would have trouble *not* taking sides (staying neutral):

a. _____

b. _____

23. List three skills that you think are important or necessary to be a good mediator:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

24. Why do you want to be a peer mediator? _____

_____

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

SCHOOL MEDIATION INTAKE FORM

Date _____ Case ID: _____

Initiating Party _____

Homeroom _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

Has the Initiating Party used mediation before?

☐ Yes, as Initiating Party ☐ Party

☐ Yes, as Responding ☐ No

Responding Party _____

Homeroom _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

Has the Responding Party used mediation before?

☐ Yes, as Initiating Party ☐ Yes, as Responding Party ☐ No

Have these parties been in mediation together before?

☐ Yes, different conflict ☐ Yes, same conflict ☐ No

How long have these parties been involved with this current conflict?

☐ Not sure ☐ More than one week but less than a month ☐ One month or more

☐ One week or less

Referred by (name): _____

☐ Teacher ☐ Counselor ☐ Self

☐ Student ☐ NTA ☐ Other _____

This Conflict Involves:

☐ Disagreement (verbal) ☐ Truancy ☐ Property

☐ Rumors ☐ Behavior ☐ Money

☐ Fighting (physical) ☐ Rules ☐ Other_____

Presenting Problem: _____

Was a Mediation Scheduled?

☐ Yes ☐ No, explain _____

Mediation Date: _____ **Time:** _____ **Room:** _____

Co-Mediators Assigned: 1. _____ 2. _____

© *1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA*

SCHOOL MEDIATION AGREEMENT FORM

INITIATING PARTY

Name _____

Grade _____

Homeroom _____

RESPONDING PARTY

Name _____

Grade _____

Homeroom _____

As an outcome of the Mediation session held on _____.

All parties agree to the following terms: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

INITIATING PARTY _____

Mediator _____

RESPONDING PARTY _____

Mediator _____

SCHOOL MEDIATOR DE-BRIEFING FORM

Mediation Date: _____ Case ID: _____

Mediator completing this form: _____

Who was your Co-Mediator in this case? _____

What was the main issue being mediated?

☐ Disagreement (verbal) ☐ Behavior ☐ Property

☐ Fighting (physical) ☐ Rules ☐ Money

☐ Truancy ☐ Rumors ☐ Other_____

Did you or your co-mediator mention confidentiality in the opening statement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Did you and your co-mediator caucus with the parties?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Did you or your co-mediator mention confidentiality in each of the caucuses?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Did caucusing appear to help the parties reach an agreement?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Was there anything else the mediator(s) could have done to aid the parties?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

How satisfied do you think the Initiating Party was when the mediation ended?

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Unsatisfied ☐ Not sure

☐ Satisfied ☐ Very Unsatisfied

Explain:

_____

How satisfied do you think the Responding Party was when the mediation ended?

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Unsatisfied ☐ Not sure

☐ Satisfied ☐ Very Unsatisfied

Explain:

_____

How satisfied are you, as the mediator, with the way the mediation went?

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Unsatisfied ☐ Not sure

☐ Satisfied ☐ Very Unsatisfied

Explain: _____

How satisfied are you with the way you and your co-mediator worked together during the mediation?

☐ Very Satisfied ☐ Unsatisfied ☐ Not sure

☐ Satisfied ☐ Very Unsatisfied

Explain: _____

Was there anything about this mediation that made it difficult to stay neutral (not take sides)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Based on this mediation, is there anything that you would have liked to have learned more about in training?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

In looking back, is there anything you wish you had done differently in this mediation?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Was an Agreement reached?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Explain: _____

Was follow-up recommended?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Explain: _____

Other Comments: _____

_____

© 1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA

SCHOOL-BASED PEER MEDIATION
EVALUATION BY PARTIES

Date: _____ Case ID: _____

Thank you for using mediation. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about your experience in mediation.

Your school: _____

Your age: _____ Your grade: (5-12) _____

Your sex:

☐ Female ☐ Male

Your race:

☐ African American ☐ Caucasian ☐ Inter-racial describe: _____ ☐ Other describe: _____

☐ Asian ☐ Hispanic

Were you the INITIATING PARTY (asking for mediation) or the RESPONDING PARTY (agreeing to mediation) for this conflict?

☐ Initiating ☐ Responding ☐ Not sure

Was this the first time you have used mediation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, how many times have you used mediation to resolve a conflict?

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ More than 3

Was this your first mediation experience with *this* other party?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, how many times have you used mediation to resolve a conflict with *this* other party?

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ More than 3

Did someone explain mediation before it took place?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

If yes, who? _____

Did someone ask you if you were willing to go to mediation before it took place?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

If yes, who? _____

Was your mediation held in a place that was private?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Did the mediator(s) explain what would happen in mediation before it started?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did the mediator(s) explain that everything said in mediation would be kept secret (confidential)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did you trust and believe the mediator(s)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did the mediator(s) help you identify the problems to discuss during the mediation session?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did the mediator(s) keep from taking sides with the other party during the mediation session?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did the mediator(s) give you enough time to explain your side of the situation?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did the mediator(s) listen to your ideas about how to settle the conflict?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Did the mediator(s) help you and the other party understand each other's point of view in the conflict?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Explain: _____

Was an agreement reached?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If YES, how satisfied are you with the agreement?

☐ Very satisfied ☐ Mixed ☐ Very unsatisfied

☐ Satisfied ☐ Unsatisfied

Explain: _____

Do you think that you would use mediation again?

☐ Definitely yes ☐ Not sure ☐ Definitely not
☐ Probably yes ☐ Probably not

Explain: _____

Do you think that you would suggest mediation for other students who are involved in a conflict?

☐ Definitely yes ☐ Not sure ☐ Definitely not
☐ Probably yes ☐ Probably not

Explain: _____

Are you interested in training to be a mediator?

☐ Definitely yes ☐ Not sure ☐ Definitely not
☐ Probably yes ☐ Probably not

What did you learn from this mediation about how to settle conflicts in the future?

_____

_____

_____

Is there anything else about your experience with mediation that you would like us to know?

_____

_____

_____

© 1993, Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program, Philadelphia, PA

APPENDIX D
PEER MEDIATION PROJECT SUMMARY

GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE MEDIATION PROGRAM SCHOOL-BASED MEDIATION COMPONENT

Pilot Project

The School-Based Mediation Pilot Project began in 1987 with the goal of institutionalizing the mediation process within the school setting. The objective is to teach effective communication and participatory decisionmaking to youth who will carry these skills with them into their families and other relationships within society.

During the pilot project, from 1987 through 1991, VISTA volunteers worked within the Philadelphia School District to train students to mediate disputes among their peers. Over 30,000 students received mediation orientation, 242 students completed the 24-hour peer mediation training, and approximately 300 documented peer mediations were held. The issues mediated include: fair play; miscommunication; borrowed items; lateness; truancy; and suspensions.

Under the VISTA-supported pilot project, the following schools received school-based mediation training: Martin Luther King; Strawberry Mansion; Pickett; Cooke; Amy 6; Ada Lewis; and Wagner. After phasing out the four-year VISTA project, the Mediation Program has continued to train in schools on an *ad hoc* basis as it furthers its goal of institutionalizing mediation within the schools. Several other schools have contracted for peer mediation training: Wanamaker; Parkway at Spring Garden; and Little Flower Catholic High School for Girls.

When the grant money ran out, Little Flower and Strawberry Mansion were the only schools to maintain their peer mediation programs independently. All of the public school programs folded.

Teen Mediators

About 20 students who were trained to mediate during the pilot project took additional training to co-mediate with adult mediators to help resolve Parent-Youth disputes at Good Shepherd. The teens also started their own professional association, the Youth Mediators of Philadelphia, which meets regularly at Good Shepherd. Several have graduated from college and are now Peer Mediation Trainers at Good Shepherd.

Teacher Training

The Mediation Program also offers "Mediation Skills for Teachers" as part of the Philadelphia School District's Inservice Program. More than 80 teachers have completed the 30-hour course.

Philadelphia Peer Mediation Collaborative

After evaluating the Pilot Project and redesigning its administration, in 1993 the Mediation Program and the Philadelphia School District Office of Desegregation collaborated to seek funding to institutionalize peer mediation in 60 middle and high schools over three years (1993-1995). The School Mediation Project is partially funded by William Penn Foundation, the Connelly Foundation and the Thomas Skelton Harrison Foundation. Approximately 20 schools per school year will be trained. Schools are selected according to their perceived willingness to maintain peer mediation on their own following a year of technical assistance from Good Shepherd. Additional funding is being sought to meet the Budget for this project.

To date, 29 public middle and high schools participated in the program and there is a long list of schools waiting to be trained. This project is the largest of its scope to be implemented in such a large, culturally diverse urban setting. The project is being formally evaluated by the Temple University Department of Rhetoric and Communication.

Catholic High School Collaborative

The Connelly Foundation fully funded Good Shepherd for one year to replicate the public school peer mediation institutionalization program in four Catholic High Schools (Northeast, West, Cardinal Dougherty, and Little Flower). To date, 73 students and 11 adult staff have been trained; and more than 5,000 students have attended a mediation orientation assembly. To date, 24 mediations have been held; agreements were reached in 23.

Credentials

The Good Shepherd staff trainers are all professional mediators who have received numerous hours of training. The staff is involved in continuing education and training through professional development and membership in mediation professional associations including the Pennsylvania Council of Mediators (PCM), the National Association for Mediation in Education (NAME) and the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR).

CC-8/94

PHILADELPHIA PEER MEDIATION PROJECT
SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

1. Letter of request for peer mediation implementation from School Principal to Good Shepherd Neighborhood House.

2. Initial meeting with School Principal and School Leadership Team and Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program School Mediation Project Manager and/or Executive Director. The Mediation Program reserves the right to decline the invitation to enter any school following the initial interview.

3. If the school and the Mediation Program agree to implement a peer mediation program at the school, an agreement is signed by the School Principal and the Mediation Program Executive Director.

4. Good Shepherd staff provides Mediation Orientation for Faculty and Staff – usually at a faculty meeting. A Peer Mediation Task Force (or Leadership Team) is created, including at a minimum, the School Principal and the four adults who will participate in the peer mediation training. The School Principal also designates a Site Coordinator who will act as the liaison between the school and the Mediation Program and coordinate the peer mediation program.

5. Good Shepherd staff offers Recruitment Assemblies (or other activities as suggested by the school) to interest students in volunteering to participate in the peer mediation training.

6. A Good Shepherd Mediation Trainer is assigned to the school. The Trainer assigned to the school and one other Good Shepherd Mediation Trainer co-facilitate 24 hours of peer mediation training for 16 students and 4 adults (usually a combination of teachers, counselors, nonteaching staff, and/or parents). The school is responsible for providing substitute coverage for the teachers released from class to attend the training. Only those who complete all 24 hours will receive a Certificate of Completion.

7. The Peer Mediation Leadership Team meets with the Good Shepherd Project Manager and the Mediation Trainer to complete the *How to Implement a Peer Mediation Program* workbook. This usually takes from 3 to 6 hours.

8. The Mediation Trainer meets with the Site Coordinator and provides technical assistance once a week. Technical assistance includes, but is not limited to:

   - refresher training for peer mediators.
   - working with the Site Coordinator to set up the case management system (referrals, intake, scheduling, evaluating, gathering statistics).
   - working with the Site Coordinator and the Peer Mediators to develop and implement public relations activities (e.g., classroom presentations, Home and School Association presentations, video commercials for the school TV network, articles for school and local newspapers, hallway signage, etc.)
   - working with the Site Coordinator to establish a Peer Mediator club (formal or informal, before- or after-school gatherings).
   - monitoring mediations.

9. The Site Coordinator receives a copy of the *Peer Mediation Trainer's Guide* and plans a training for the next semester. More students and adults are recruited. The Site Coordinator leads the training. The Good Shepherd Mediation Trainer assists.

10. Data is maintained by the Site Coordinator and collected in December and January by the Mediation Trainer. The data is forwarded to Tricia Jones at Temple University for evaluation purposes.

11. At the end of Year I, the School Principal, the Site Coordinator, the Good Shepherd Mediation Trainer and/or the Project Manager and/or the Executive Director hold an "Exit Interview" to reflect on Year I and discuss Year II.

12. Year II – the School independently maintains the Peer Mediation Program, training new mediators and staff as needed to refresh the mediator pool. Good Shepherd is available for technical assistance on an as-needed basis.

13. The Mediation Program attempts to schedule at least one networking meeting per school year to give the participating schools a chance to meet and discuss program successes, obstacles, benefits and techniques.

SCHOOL-BASED MEDIATION AGREEMENT

Agreement between _____
(hereinafter "the school") and the MEDIATION PROGRAM AT GOOD SHEPHERD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE (hereinafter the Mediation Program).

The school agrees to:

- provide four (adult) site coordinators (e.g., teachers, counselors, parents, nonteaching assistants) who can fulfill 30 hours of mediation training during school hours and who volunteer to participate in the mediation program at your school.
- recruit 16 student volunteers to participate in 24 hours of training and who agree to become a peer mediator.
- provide school hours and appropriate space for training.
- maintain the School-Based Mediation Program for at least three years following the initial training (including training a minimum of 16 new mediators each semester).
- provide a Mediation Room where mediation sessions can be held in private and a locking filing cabinet to store mediated agreements.
- promote the use of the mediation process to resolve conflicts between students.
- agree that the mediation files are confidential and will not be accessed by school personnel (other than the site coordinators) or used for punitive purposes.

The Mediation Program agrees to:

- offer student recruitment activities (e.g., assembly and/or homeroom presentations).
- offer teacher/staff orientation activities (e.g., staff meeting presentations).
- train 16 student mediators and 4 site coordinators.
- provide the training manuals, sample forms and procedures for implementing the School-Based Mediation Program.
- provide technical assistance one day per week during year 1.
- provide refresher training and technical assistance, as needed, during years 2 through 3.

_____ _____
Executive Director, Mediation Program School Principal

_____
Date

SCHOOL-BASED MEDIATION TRAINERS

GENERAL JOB SUMMARY

SBM Trainers work ten-months. Their schedules coincide with the academic calendar. Each Mediation Trainer's contract may be renewed annually for the duration of the three-year SBM Project. Renewals will be based solely on performance as judged by the Mediation Program SBM Project Manager and the Executive Director. Health Insurance will continue during the two-month summer hiatus. Trainers will be paid every other week. The work year and hours (including holidays and in-service days) will coincide with the Philadelphia School District schedule. Travel expenses will be paid separately, on a monthly basis.

Trainers are responsible for training and monitoring student mediators and site coordinators at Philadelphia public schools included in the SBM Project. Each trainer will be responsible for four schools.

Specific Responsibilities

- Visit each school assigned one school-day per week.
- Train a minimum of 16 student mediators and four designated site coordinators at each school to which they are assigned.
- Train the Mediation Coordinators to perform the duties outlined in the Site Coordinator Sample Job Description, as customized for the particular school.
- Monitor mediations at each school following the initial training for quality assurance.
- Coordinate a Mediation Club (or related group) at each assigned school.
- Attend weekly staff meetings and professional development courses at Good Shepherd Neighborhood House.
- Maintain mediation statistics as assigned by the SBM Project Manager.
- Related duties as assigned by the SBM Project Manager.

Requirements

Experienced mediator with interpersonal skills which reflect an ability to work as a team member and handle stress constructively. Enthusiasm for the mediation process and loyalty to the ideals and goals of the Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program. College degree in a related field preferred.

SITE COORDINATOR
SAMPLE JOB DESCRIPTION

Each participating school designates a Site Coordinator to participate in the Peer Mediation Training and act as a liaison between the school and Good Shepherd Neighborhood House Mediation Program. During Year I, the Good Shepherd Mediation Trainer will work closely with the Site Coordinator to develop and implement the peer mediation program at the school. The Site Coordinator must have completed the 24-hour Peer Mediation Training and the "How To Start a School-Based Mediation Program" workbook. The workbook may be completed by the Peer Mediation Leadership Team (as a group) or by the Site Coordinator and Good Shepherd Mediation Trainer.

ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

- Publicize the mediation program (e.g., school newspaper, fliers, local newspaper, Parent Association newsletter, hallway signage, etc.).
- Schedule presentations describing the mediation process to the staff and home and school association encourage them to support the mediation program.
- Meet with school staff and administrators frequently to assess the program's viability.
- Maintain appropriate forms (e.g., Referrals, Intakes, Agreements, Mediation Evaluations, Debriefings, etc.).
- Maintain statistics for evaluation purposes (e.g., referrals, intakes, mediations held, agreements, follow-up, etc.).
- Monitor student mediators' academic grades and conduct.
- Each semester, gather and hand in student mediator data and statistical data to Good Shepherd for the Philadelphia Peer Mediation Project Evaluation conducted by Temple University principal and/or other designated administrators.

TRAINING RESPONSIBLITIES

- Schedule orientation sessions designed to introduce the mediation process to the school population and recruit new mediators.
- Peer mediator recruitment activities.
- Survey selection of students to be trained.
- Train new peer mediators and staff.
- Prepare and distribute training certificates.
- Sponsor a Peer Mediator club or regular meetings of the peer mediators.
- Develop refresher trainings for mediators.

MEDIATION COORDINATION/SUPERVISION

- Assess referrals.
- Perform mediation intake; describe the mediation process to the conflicting parties and encourage them to opt for mediation.
- Schedule mediation sessions.
- Schedule mediator availability.
- Supervise mediations (or assign trained supervisors).
- Debrief mediators.

ERIC

CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS
Indiana University
Smith Research Center, Suite 150
2805 East Tenth Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
(812) 335-5847

MEMO

TO: ~~Program Participants~~
~~International Communication Association~~
~~June 24-29, 1990~~

FROM: Nola Aiex, ERIC/RCS Coordinator of Documents

SUBJECT: Submitting Papers to ERIC

If you presented a paper at this convention, ERIC/RCS is very interested in reviewing it for possible inclusion in the ERIC database. Part of this procedure includes requesting permission from the authors to reproduce their material. In order to save time for all concerned, we are including this request with this mailing.

If you would like to submit your document for consideration, please fill out the reproduction release form on the reverse side of this letter, and send it along with ***two copies*** of your paper to my attention. Entering a document into the ERIC system in no way affects your copyright or your right to submit it for publication elsewhere.

To meet stringent microfiche requirements, copies must be clean, type must be dark and clear; dot matrix print is only acceptable if it is LETTER QUALITY. In other words, we can no longer accept 9-pin draft quality documents. We must have letter quality or laser printed documents.

An abstract of your document will appear in ERIC's monthly journal of abstracts, *Resources in Education*, three or four months after we first receive it. Your paper will then be accessible on microfiche and/or paper copy to students, teachers, policymakers, researchers and other users of the ERIC system. (Keep in mind that your paper will be reproduced *exactly* as we receive it.) We will send you a complimentary copy of your paper on microfiche.

We would also be happy to consider any other papers you may have on hand. If you'd like more information about ERIC, please write or call. We're eager to hear from you.